

The JOURNAL of
SOUTHERN
HISTORY

VOL. V

AUGUST, 1939

NO. 3



Published quarterly by the
SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

The Journal of Southern History

VOLUME V

AUGUST, 1939

NUMBER 3

Published Quarterly by
THE SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

BOARD OF EDITORS

JOHN D. BARNHART
Louisiana State University

CHARLES W. RAMSDELL
University of Texas

AVERY O. CRAVEN
University of Chicago

WALTER B. POSEY
Birmingham-Southern College

WILLIAM O. LYNCH
Indiana University

PHILIP DAVIDSON
Agnes Scott College

FRANK L. OWSLFY
Vanderbilt University

W. NEIL FRANKLIN
The National Archives

MANAGING EDITOR

WENDELL H. STEPHENSON, Louisiana State University

EDITORIAL ASSOCIATE

FRED C. COLE, Louisiana State University

GUARANTOR

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

Correspondence in regard to contributions to the *Journal* should be sent to the Managing Editor, Louisiana State University, University, Louisiana.

The Southern Historical Association supplies the *Journal* to its members. The annual membership fee is three dollars; upon payment of fifty dollars, any person may become a life member. Single numbers of the *Journal* are available at seventy-five cents. Membership applications and checks should be sent to the Secretary-Treasurer.

The Southern Historical Association disclaims responsibility for statements made by contributors.

Entered as second-class matter April 5, 1935, at the Post Office at University, Louisiana, under the Act of August 24, 1912.

CONTENTS

<i>The "Turner Theories" and the South.</i> By Avery Craven	291
<i>The Effects of the Civil War on the Louisiana Sugar Industry.</i> By Walter Prichard	315
<i>Cultural Factors in the History of the South.</i> By Richard H. Shryock	333
<i>The American Society of Equity in Kentucky: A Recent Attempt in Agrarian Reform.</i> By Theodore Saloutos	347
<i>Notes and Documents</i>	
Ulrich Bonnell Phillips: Historian of the South. By Fred Landon	364
Southern Designs on Cuba, 1854-1857, and Some European Opinions. Edited by Gavin B. Henderson	371
<i>Book Reviews</i>	
Shotwell, <i>The History of History</i> , I, by Charles Edward Smith	386
Edwards, <i>The Early Writings of Frederick Jackson Turner</i> , by W. Stull Holt	387
Marable and Boylan, <i>A Handbook of Oklahoma Writers</i> , by James W. Moffitt	389
Forman, <i>Jamestown and St. Mary's, Buried Cities of Romance</i> , by Wesley Frank Craven	390
Griggs, <i>Thomas Clarkson: The Friend of Slaves</i> , by Gilbert H. Barnes	392
Sonne, <i>Liberal Kentucky, 1780-1828</i> , by R. S. Cotterill	393
Owen, <i>Alabama: A Social and Economic History of the State</i> , by John B. Clark	394
Kohn and Glenn, <i>Internal Improvement in South Carolina, 1817-1828</i> , by David C. Duniway	395
Newsome, <i>The Presidential Election of 1824 in North Carolina</i> , by Charles S. Sydnor	396
Fraser, <i>Democracy in the Making: The Jackson-Tyler Era</i> , by Fletcher M. Green	397
Clark, <i>The Rampaging Frontier</i> , by Carl Wittke	398
Burne, <i>Lee, Grant and Sherman: A Study in Leadership in the 1864-65 Campaign</i> , by Thomas Robson Hay	400
Stern, <i>The Man Who Killed Lincoln</i> , by William H. Ellison	401
Horn, <i>Invisible Empire: The Story of the Ku Klux Klan, 1866-1871</i> , by R. H. Woody	402
Bond, <i>Negro Education in Alabama</i> , by Curtis W. Garrison	404
Crowell, <i>Personal Recollections of Trinity College, North Carolina, 1887-1894</i> , by Holland Thompson	405
Davidson, <i>Child Labor Legislation in the Southern Textile States</i> , by C. Vann Woodward	407
Palmer, <i>Carter Glass: Unreconstructed Rebel</i> , by Allen W. Moger	408
James, <i>George W. Truett: A Biography</i> , by H. A. Trexler	410
<i>Historical News and Notices</i>	411
Personal	412
Historical Societies	415
Bibliographical	418
<i>Contributors</i>	427

The "Turner Theories" and the South¹

BY AVERY CRAVEN

"Each age tries to form its own conception of the past."² According to its own standards it selects and emphasizes. From what seems to be significant it writes its history. But time alters historical values. That which impresses one generation as important may not seem so to the next. That which explains clearly to one group of men the course of events may appear to a later group to be entirely inadequate. History is, therefore, never fixed. It is never final.

A generation ago (1893) Frederick Jackson Turner arose in emphatic protest against the interpretation of American history which predecessors had handed down, and which his instructors at Johns Hopkins still accepted. It emphasized the germ theory of politics and held that American institutions were but a continuation of European beginnings. Turner, fresh from Wisconsin where he had seen the last stages of the frontier pass into modern complexity, felt that this did not explain facts as he knew them. He was confident that European institutions and practices, forced constantly to adjust themselves to new physical environments in the American West, were altered to some degree and became less European and more American.³ Perhaps also he was lifting a Western voice, along with Populist and farmer, who in the early 1890's felt themselves neglected, the term "businessman" too narrowly defined, and

¹ This paper was read at the annual meeting of the Southern Historical Association in New Orleans, November 3, 1938. It was subtitled: "To what extent do the theories and studies of Frederick Jackson Turner constitute a true interpretation of the development of the South?"

² *The Early Writings of Frederick Jackson Turner* (Madison, Wis., 1938), 52.

³ Frederick J. Turner to Carl Becker, December 16, 1925 (Huntington Library).

the interest of those in power too much centered on Eastern industrialists. The West, in general, was in a protesting mood.⁴

At any rate, the Turner suggestion took hold. A few staid historians on the Atlantic coast went their way quite untouched. Turner never won more than footnote recognition from some of them. But in the West, where state universities were beginning to expand at an unheard of rate, the approach he offered carried conviction in line with things still to be observed. American history began to be "reinterpreted and re-written because of him." For the next forty years, as one scholar has said, he "so completely dominated American historical writing that hardly a single production in all that time . . . failed to show the marks of his influence."⁵

But times have changed and with them our tastes in historical interpretation. The revisionists have fallen on Turner. One of them solemnly tells us that Turner's influence has been all to the bad; that he turned the eyes of the historians toward the frontier when they should have been fixed upon Europe and the international situations of which we were soon to be so much a part. Turner talked of *sectional* cleavage and interests when he should have emphasized the far more important *class* conflict, which is, as anyone should know, the really important division in American life. This critic speaks of Turner's work as an "extraordinary collection of learning . . . quite worthless."⁶

Most of these criticisms and of others which have been offered are based on the assumption that Turner intended to present a very clear and exact theory of American history and that this theory presumed to offer "a true and complete interpretation" of the development of the United States and of different sections in the United States. If the assumptions be correct, no one should be surprised that the modern historian, with his keener appreciation of the complexity of human affairs, has come to question the value of Turner's work. Most certainly in a

⁴ Avery Craven, "Frederick Jackson Turner," in William T. Hutchinson (ed.), *Marcus W. Jernegan Essays in American Historiography* (Chicago, 1937), 252-70.

⁵ Merle E. Curti, in Stuart A. Rice (ed.) *Methods in Social Science* (Chicago, 1931), 367; Louis M. Hacker, in the *Nation* (New York, 1865-), CXXXVII (1933), 108.

⁶ Hacker, in the *Nation*, CXXXVII, 108-10.

field like that of the South, where most of the scholarly research has been done since Turner wrote and where revision is the order of the day, a careful restatement of the "frontier thesis" and a revaluation of its application is in order.

The best statement of Turner's "theories," I presume, is to be found in the essay entitled "The Significance of the Frontier in American History." Turner later made some slight alterations in the views there expressed and changed the emphasis somewhat, but the original statement was the one seized upon and ever adhered to by "followers"—a breed of pest by which Turner was unusually cursed—and given by them wide application and wider currency.

The major assertions in this essay were to the effect that American history up to 1890 had been largely the history of the colonization of the West; that the "peculiarity of American institutions" was "the fact that they had been compelled to adapt themselves to the changes of an expanding people" who entered a succession of wildernesses and attempted to transform them into urban complexity.⁷ Because the point of most pronounced change, through the interaction of men and institutions and environment on each other, was on the outer edge of advance, Turner centered attention there. He called it "the frontier" and said that the significant thing about it was the fact that it lay "at the hither edge of free land."⁸ But he was evidently using the term very loosely, for he later spoke of an Indian and hunter stage, of traders and herdsmen, of exploitive single-crop farmers, and called the thing he was talking about "a process" not unlike that through which the human race had passed in its long journey upward from savagery to factories.⁹

He described the various types of frontiers and their modes of advance and then turned to the results produced by the process on men and institutions. What were the effects of being ever in motion, always readjusting to a new environment? What was added to or subtracted from the European peoples and practices by being planted on the Eastern seaboard and then pushed steadily westward for three centuries?

⁷ Frederick J. Turner, *The Frontier in American History* (New York, 1920), 2.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 3.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 11.

Turner's answer was unquestionably intended to be both broad and general. Yet it had, unfortunately, to deal with specific qualities and characteristics. He believed that successive returns to the primitive and the forced readjustments to new environments caused men and institutions to be better fitted to the requirements of this continent. They were, in other words, *Americanized*.¹⁰ That meant both the exaggeration of old traits and the addition of new ones. It might mean only a change in tone and temper.

The first change, developed in a somewhat confused and vague fashion in Turner's essay, had to do with *Nationalism*. As a mixing and melting pot the West blended different European groups into a "composite nationality."¹¹ Local questions, such as slavery, became national through expansion. Trade became internal to a new degree, and domestic problems, such as land, internal improvements, and markets, tended to crowd aside those which dealt with foreign affairs. Even the Constitution was modified because Louisiana had to be purchased in the interests of Western men.¹²

A second result had to do with that illusive thing called democracy. In this case it seems to have meant the increase of rugged individualism, as "fools" insisted on putting on their own coats for themselves, in the broadening of the franchise, and in a larger participation by common men in politics.¹³

Lastly, the frontier tended to change the fiber and mental attitudes of men themselves, by adding a "coarseness and strength combined with acuteness and inquisitiveness," a "practical, inventive turn of mind," a "masterful grasp of material things," and "a buoyancy and exuberance" of spirit born of freedom and opportunity.¹⁴

In later writings something is said of the idealism engendered by the chance to begin over again in a constantly reshaping society. Much is made of the sectionalism which arose as different streams of population

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 18.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 22.

¹² *Ibid.*, 25.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 30.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 37.

occupied differing physical basins and as a new and more native order arose to contend with older ones.

The general implication in this approach, as I see it, is that a new flavor, more American, was imparted to men and ways which experienced this constant retrial on a succession of frontiers. Yet on closer examination, this flavor proves to be a very uncertain thing. The emerging American qualities turn out to be only a bundle of contradictions. The West bred nationalism and sectionalism at the same time; it encouraged rugged individualism and yet forced a new degree of co-operation if men were to survive its dangers; it made its people coarse and material in mind and turned them into dreamers and idealists; it welcomed the innovator and forced a conservative conformity to existing practices upon those who would remain alive; it practiced democracy but tolerated slavery and set men to grasping for all the means to inequality.

What are we to conclude from such contradictions? Either that Turner had only a very vague conception of his own contribution or that he considered these effects of the frontier, on which so many scholars have seized as the sum and substance of "the Turner thesis," as of no major importance. The conclusion is obvious. Turner believed that the *process* he was describing was the significant thing, not its effects on individuals and practices. Along that line it was only necessary to notice general drifts and to state them in general terms. Crosscurrents in the larger streams could be ignored. His emphasis was on *change*, not on *specific changes*. The *approach* was the important thing, not some exact pattern which might appear in its application. In fact, an exact pattern in all regions was not to be expected. The social and racial groups and the cultural patterns which moved out from old centers into the American West differed too greatly from each other. Those of New England or the Middle States differed as much from those of the South as did the environments into which they were thrust. The English groups carried different cultural patterns, such as home life or agricultural practices, from those of the German or Scotch-Irish who moved alongside of them. The West worked changes, sometimes great,

sometimes small, on each of these. But it was primarily a change in flavor, not in form, save as all became gradually "Americanized." Frontiers differed. They did tend to develop a more or less common outlook and a few common practices, but differing cultural patterns still persisted. A Swedish settlement on the frontier differed from a German one; a timber frontier differed from a mining camp. Frontiers should be compared for greatest historical comprehension. In no other way could the influence of sectionalism in American history be properly understood.

The basic facts which Turner suggested for a better understanding of American history were, therefore, first: that throughout the formative period the new Wests, with something of common needs and outlook, were the most typical and the most influential portions of the nation; and second: that Wests in turn became Easts, leaving the future to sectional and class conflicts which might produce quite another America showing the traces of frontier experiences only as a landscape reveals the action of glaciers in ages long passed.

That Turner thought that this approach—I call it an approach, not a theory or a thesis—applied to the South, there can be no question. That he considered it, in itself, "a true interpretation of the development of the South," or of any other section, for that matter, I seriously doubt. There was never anything final or dogmatic about Turner. He once said that "this paper makes no attempt to treat the subject exhaustively; its aim is to call attention to the frontier as a fertile field for investigation and to suggest some of the problems which arise in connection with it."¹⁵ But within those limits he did include the Southern advances into the West without reservations of any kind. He mentions the various frontier stages shown in Virginia and the Carolinas—trapper, herdsman, and exploitive farmer, and includes the fall line and the Southern mountains among the natural frontier boundaries that are to be noted. It was at Cumberland Gap that he took his station to

¹⁵ Turner to Constance L. Skinner, March 18, 1922, "Notes Concerning my Correspondence with Frederick Jackson Turner," in *Wisconsin Magazine of History* (Menasha, Madison, 1917-), XIX (1935), 91-103.

watch these stages moving, procession-like, into the interior. He notes the Western influence on Southern land legislation, religious developments, and slavery attitudes, and climaxes his political discussion by asserting that the West made Jefferson's democracy into the national republicanism of Monroe and the democracy of Jackson—all three Southern men. He finds his best illustrations of sectionalism, produced by expansion, in the Southern colonies and states.¹⁶ The Regulator movements in the Carolinas and the constitutional struggles in Virginia and North Carolina stand out in his pages as significant evidences of both the sectional and the democratic force of the West.¹⁷

In a second essay entitled "The Old West,"¹⁸ Turner enlarges on these Southern applications. The Western angles of Bacon's Rebellion and the early establishment up the James of Indian trading posts and forts, where "the warlike Christian man" was to be stationed, are a part of his picture of "the fighting frontier." The "cow-drovers" in the piedmont, wandering from range to range, followed by the Scotch-Irish, German, Welsh, and English farmers, each group with its own peculiar brand of evangelical faith, the grasping speculator and the ever-present squatter help to form what he calls "the New Society"—more democratic, more self-sufficing, more primitive and individualistic than that which had evolved out of Old World beginnings on the Atlantic coast.

This new order in the Southern West created internal trade, raised the issues of nativism and lower standards of living, and set the old, on the coast, and the new, in the interior, in conflict over such questions as a broader franchise, a more equitable representation, a wider religious toleration, the use of slaves, and even the proper relations between the colonies and the Mother Country. Most certainly Turner found the Southern frontier significant and the early Southern Wests to reveal all the traits and to exercise all the influences which he had described as typical.

Here were Old World patterns set down in a wilderness—a country-gentleman ideal, peculiar forms of local government—including as es-

¹⁶ Turner, *Frontier in American History*, 29.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 113-21.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 67-125.

sentials the county court, the sheriff, and the county lieutenant, an established church, and a tradition to aristocracy. Here also were German, Scotch-Irish, and other groups with cultural patterns quite distinct. All had come to America—the first great West. All had been changed to some degree. The interplay of environment and institutions had given something new in temper as well as in practice which in the end made harmony between England and the colonies impossible. Europeans had become Americans.

Further expansion into the interior had produced another social unit differing in turn from that on the coast. It too had found that the political ties which bound it to an older society gave less than satisfactory scope for development. The ending of primogeniture and entail, the broadening of religious freedom, the readjustment of representation and the franchise, and even the shifting of capitals to the westward, had all come in answer to its demands. The new Wests of the South had demonstrated both their differing character and their increasing power. They had also altered old practices and old institutions to the more simple requirements of the small-farming economy which they practiced. The great piedmont region above the fall line, sweeping from Pennsylvania to Middle Georgia, formed a unity in itself as against the separate entities into which the coastal region was divided. In characteristics and attitudes it met all the Turner requirements. In course of development and in influence it provided a satisfactory case study for his approach.

Up to this point, I take it, few would deny the value of the Turner "theories and studies" in making an approach to the "development of the South." The process of change from old to new, and the sectionalism produced by expansion and readjustment are fundamental to any clear understanding of the section. Even democracy, when understood as men of that day understood it—as a stirring for the recognition of new groups and rights—is clearly discernible; nationalism, in the sense of turning attention to native problems and seeking native answers to them, flavors the whole story. No historian, as far as I know, has ques-

tioned the value of the Turner approach to this period, or doubted the soundness of its conclusions. The real problem comes with the rise of the Cotton Kingdom. There conditions become so complex and tangled that even Turner himself seems to have been somewhat uncertain. Others have frankly denied the continuation of the Western process and viewed the entire South as a unique entity in the national pattern.

Professor Frederic Logan Paxson is particularly emphatic on this point. He insists that because the plantation and Negro slavery played a part in the settlement of the Southwest the region forfeited its Western character and began "living in a new cycle." "In the generation that ends at Gettysburg and Vicksburg," he says, "the South ceased to be the West, and became enchained in a destiny of its own, in one of the great tragedies of social history." Because it did not reproduce the pattern which was being worked out in the Northwest of the day, it did not stay "true to the American standard."¹⁹ Other scholars, while not directly denying the validity of the Turner approach, have laid emphasis on other things and found other central themes in the Southern story. The late Ulrich Bonnell Phillips once argued that the race question gave unity to Southern history and declared that the determination to keep the section a white man's country explained the larger course of developments.²⁰ Another writer, trying to explain what makes the South Southern, has listed its weather, its English country-gentleman ideal, its Negroes, and its dominantly rural character as the essential ingredients. He has found its story from 1830 to 1861 to have been shaped primarily by the constant necessity of defending itself against a Northern crusade, launched first against slavery but later broadened out to include the whole Southern way of life.²¹ The inference is that the frontier and the influences which it normally produced are lost in the struggle between North and South. True, these sections did come to conflict over the matter of slavery in the new territories, but the contest in Kansas in the fifties was more a manifestation of hostilities already engendered

¹⁹ Frederic L. Paxson, *When the West is Gone* (New York, 1930), 63-65.

²⁰ Ulrich B. Phillips, "The Central Theme of Southern History," in *American Historical Review* (New York, 1895-), XXXIV (1929), 30-43.

²¹ Avery Craven, *The Repressible Conflict, 1830-1861* (University, La., 1939), Chap. I.

over other issues than a struggle over actual slavery expansion. There were only three slaves in Kansas in 1860.

What then of the frontier theory in this period? Did it cease to apply? Did a factor which had been of such great significance in an earlier period cease to influence the course of development in this? If so the abolition charge that the ante-bellum South was thoroughly un-American had some foundation.

To begin with, it should be understood that expansion of far greater proportions than the Old South had ever experienced went on in the period from 1820 to 1860. The pressure from wasted lands, failing markets, and unsatisfactory political conditions in the Eastern states was never so great. The lure of fresh lands, where cotton might grow and restore the failing fortunes of the section, was never quite so strong. Out of Virginia, the Carolinas, Georgia, and Tennessee settlers poured into the Gulf region to push back quickly the forest and to establish a new order. From 1820 to 1830 Virginia's rate of population increase fell from 37½ per cent to 13½ and in the next decade to less than 4 per cent. Speakers told of "Vast regions, once the abode of a numerous population, of plenty, and of social happiness" now "re-committed to the forest"; of "tide[s] of emigration . . . from all classes; as if the angel of desolation had cursed the land, and imbued the people with a hatred to the place of their nativity." By 1850 nearly one third of the Virginia-born were living in other states.²²

North Carolina suffered even more. Her rate of population increase fell from 15 per cent in 1830 to 2.1 per cent in 1840 and it still stood under 15 per cent in 1860. "The Alabama fever" raged with great violence and carried off "vast numbers . . . of citizens." "Anxiety and confusion" pervaded "all ranks of the people."²³ Lands lost their value and poverty became universal. Only Connecticut in this era and

²² *Seventh Census of the United States: 1850*, pp. 241 ff.; *Farmers' Register* (Shellbanks, Petersburg, Va., 1833-1842), III (1836), 685-89; II (1835), 762-64.

²³ *Seventh Census . . . 1850*, pp. 297 ff.; J. G. de Roulhac Hamilton (ed.), *Papers of Thomas Ruffin*, 4 vols. (Raleigh, 1918-1920), I, 193-95, 197-99; Guion G. Johnson, "Social Characteristics of Ante-Bellum North Carolina," in *North Carolina Historical Review* (Raleigh, 1924-), VI (1929), 144-47.

Iowa in a later one have matched the contributions to the West made by the Old North State.

The same story can be told for South Carolina and the older counties of Georgia and Tennessee. The first of these showed population gains of only 15 per cent in 1830 and of only 2¼ in 1850. In 1860 there were 193,000 South Carolina-born living outside the parent state as against 276,000 remaining at home. Forty per cent of her people had sought homes in the West. Men spoke of "the wilderness regaining her empire"; of "the once thriving planter . . . tearing himself from the scenes of his childhood, and the bones of his ancestors, to seek in the wilderness" the things not to be found at home.²⁴

The Southwest, meanwhile, grew in direct proportion to these losses. From 1830 to 1840 Alabama increased its whites by 76 per cent and its Negroes by 114; Mississippi, its whites by 154 per cent and its Negroes by 197. The actual gains in Alabama were ten times those of Virginia and twenty times those of South Carolina. And this was but the beginning of a great westward sweep that would follow the Gulf to the Mexican border and across it and reach north and west to Arkansas. The south central states, as a whole, grew three times as fast in the 1830's as did the Old South and by 1850 outnumbered the parent states by over 300,000, having added a million and a quarter in the last decade alone. As early as 1834 they were producing the bulk of the cotton crop and had begun their economic domination of the whole section.²⁵

This advance had all the characteristics usually ascribed to the westward movement. There were distinct stages which in turn conformed to the accepted patterns. Trappers and traders from the Old South had entered the Indian country well before the Revolution and had opened the ways through which others were to follow. Furs and skins became an essential part of the Southern surplus which went out from Richmond and Charleston to the world. Trade contacts altered Indian soci-

²⁴ *Seventh Census . . . 1850*, pp. 333 ff., 353 ff., 533 ff.; *Congressional Debates*, 22 Cong., 1 Sess., 80-81 (January 16, 1832).

²⁵ Thomas P. Abernethy, *The Formative Period in Alabama, 1815-1828* (Montgomery, 1922); Frederick J. Turner, *The United States, 1830-1850* (New York, 1935), 213-15; *id.*, *The Rise of the New West, 1819-1829* (New York, 1906), 47.

ety, threw the tribes into international alliances, and produced a group of half-breed leaders hardly equalled for diplomatic ability in the American story.²⁶ The frontier pressure against these tribes lifted military leaders, like Andrew Jackson, to national importance and forced the development of the nation's final Indian policy of removal and "permanent" reservations across the Mississippi River. It would be difficult to find a more typical frontier attitude and action against the red man than that revealed by the Georgians in the 1820's.²⁷

There was also a Southern pastoral stage. John G. W. de Brahm described it in the back country of the Carolinas just before the Revolution. He told of great herds of cattle sent down into Georgia, there to be herded and driven from range to range by cowpen keepers "like ancient Patriarchs or modern Bedowins." Roundups and brandings, expert horsemen, and the whole paraphernalia of the cattle trade!²⁸ A generation later cowmen were all along the borders of the Indian country awaiting the departure of the tribes for the West but not hesitating, in the face of government agreements with the Indians, to pasture their cattle on the Indian lands.²⁹ The Oklahoma "Sooner" was in the making.

By the 1840's the cowboys had reached the piney-woods section of Mississippi, where, mounted on their "low built, shaggy, but muscular and hardy horses of that region, and armed with rawhide whips . . . and sometimes with a catching rope or lasso . . . They scour[ed] the woods . . . sometimes driving a herd of a thousand heads to the pen."³⁰

The cattle days in Louisiana and Texas are better known but somehow it has not occurred to the historian that this stage of frontier development had its best expression in the South, developed its important

²⁶ Verner W. Crane, *The Southern Frontier, 1670-1732* (Durham, 1928), 108-36, 254-80.

²⁷ Ulrich B. Phillips, *Georgia and State Rights* (Washington, 1902), 39-86.

²⁸ Plowdon C. J. Weston (ed.), *Documents Connected with the History of South Carolina* (London, 1856), 200.

²⁹ Franklin L. Riley (comp.), "Autobiography of Gideon Linccum," in Mississippi Historical Society, *Publications* (Oxford, etc., 1897-1914; Centenary Series, 1916-1925), VIII (1904), 443-65.

³⁰ J. F. H. Claiborne, "A Trip through the Piney Woods," *ibid.*, IX (1906), 521.

features there, and passed out of the South into the plains west, with which it is usually associated, with only slight changes in its character.³¹

The mining stage also had its place in the Southern advance. A recent writer has told of the "gold fever" which began to "rage" in North Carolina in 1825. Travelers reported hearing "scarce anything . . . except gold"; of "bankrupts . . . restored to affluence and paupers turned to nabobs." "The prospector" became "a distinct race" and the population 'round about "agonized under the increased and increasing fever for gold." Prospectors rushed about in quicksilver fashion from diggings to diggings, boom towns rose and fell, and "the state of morals" became "deplorably bad."³² There is, in fact, little in the picture of the mining rushes which took place in North Carolina, Georgia, and Alabama in this period to distinguish them in temper or in character from those on other frontiers in other sections.

Nor did the early agricultural groups differ from those who in this period were pushing their way into the Old Northwest. The pioneering activities of Gideon Linccum,³³ which began in Georgia just after the American Revolution and ended in Texas before the Civil War, might, with local variations, have been duplicated on the crest of any other frontier rolling westward. His grandfather had been killed by the Indians in North Carolina during the Revolution. His father, after a turn at Indian fighting, had spent some ten years farming about in different parts of the Georgia uplands, raising the first crop of cotton ever grown in that part of the state. He had accumulated property rapidly. Cotton brought high prices. But the West lured. Tennessee offered greater opportunities. Three times just after 1800 he started for that state with his family now augmented by a parcel of Negroes. Each time, however, after a stop on the way to raise a crop, he turned back

³¹ Little is said of Texas, the most "Western" of the Southern states, in this paper. She entered the picture rather late but she was ready for secession with the other cotton states early in 1861. Texas was, therefore, Southern by the final test. Her Western character and spirit, on the other hand, were always so marked that writers on Western history have given her ample recognition and space. In spite of both slavery and the plantation system, no one has dared to suggest that she ever "ceased to be Western." The same holds for Arkansas. For that reason emphasis is here laid on the states east of the Mississippi.

³² Fletcher M. Green, "Gold Mining: A Forgotten Industry of Ante-Bellum North Carolina," in *North Carolina Historical Review*, XIV (1937), 1-19, 135-55.

³³ Riley (comp.), "Autobiography of Gideon Linccum," in *loc. cit.*, 443-519.

and at last settled down on the Georgia frontier to await the removal of the Muskogee Indians and the opening of their lands to settlement.

In these years the boy Gideon had learned to gather cotton and had spent a few months in the rude frontier schools. He now left home, clerked and farmed, studied medicine by reading a few books, and then got married. He showed every prospect of becoming a successful farmer until the Alabama fever caught him. Then, not waiting even to harvest his crop, he set out again with his father to seek a new home in a new wilderness. He paused for a season with the cattle men on the Okmulgee and then made his way through five hundred miles of forest to the little log town of Tuscaloosa. Two or three times later he moved on, keeping in the vanguard of settlement, sawing lumber, trading with the Indians, practicing medicine, and planting cotton. In 1834 he made a trip to Texas and after a few years longer in Mississippi moved there to end his days as a planter.

Gideon could hardly qualify as "the man of capital and enterprise" in the Turner picture, but he eminently fits the role of "the first agricultural pioneer." He presents sharp contrast to the wealthy and energetic Thomas Dabney,⁸⁴ who, finding his lands worn in old Virginia, picked up his whole plantation establishment and purchased four thousand acres of land from lesser men in Mississippi in the same year that Gideon was looking toward Texas. Gideon was the South's pioneer farmer—the exploiter of the soil's first wealth. Dabney represented the final purchaser—the man of wealth who brought "extensive" culture and permanent settlement. The two types taken together with the great body of farmers in between who were less restless than the one and less permanent than the other, complete an agricultural sequence which satisfies every requirement of the frontier process. The final pattern was not that reached in the Northwest but we should remember that Turner's emphasis was on *change*, not on some *fixed type of change*. Too long have scholars viewed the plantation as an anachronism in frontier development. It was, in fact, nothing more than the Southern expression of "capital and enterprise" in agriculture and it no more upset the

⁸⁴ Susan Dabney Smedes, *A Southern Planter: Social Life in the Old South* (New York, 1900), 1-26.

normal frontier process than did the bonanza farmers of the Northwest or the capitalist on the timber, cattle, or mining frontiers.

It should also be noticed that the flavor and practice of this great Southern West was thoroughly normal. Nor did they change any more rapidly than in any other West. "Flush days" in Alabama and Mississippi were the rule.³⁵ Speculation drove land prices up to as high as \$70 an acre and pushed interest rates to from 40 to 50 per cent. Banking wrote new chapters even in frontier financial history and left debts unpaid even to this day.³⁶ Opportunity made liars out of honest men. One of them wrote home to Virginia in July, 1835, declaring that the weather in central Alabama was never more than warm and that the nights were so cool that he always slept under a blanket.³⁷ A New Orleans newspaper described the period as one in which the people were "drunk with success." "The poor man of yesterday was worth his thousands today; and the beggar of the morning retired to his straw pallet at night, burdened with the cares of a fortune acquired between the rising and the setting of the sun."³⁸ A visitor to the Louisiana metropolis in 1833 wrote: "There is a hurry, a 'rush' among all classes of people here, that I have not seen in so great a degree, elsewhere. It looks almost like intrusion to detain any one upon matters unconnected with ordinary business-pursuits."³⁹

A Natchez citizen unblushingly complained of a sprained wrist and a dislocated thumb resulting from "a hard fought battle with Mr. Daniel Hickey, whose Eyes by the Bye I completely closed."⁴⁰ In March, 1856, the editor of an Alabama paper wrote that guns and pistols were being "fired in and from the alleys and streets of the town . . . until

³⁵ Joseph G. Baldwin, *The Flush Times of Alabama and Mississippi* (New York, 1853). For Western flavor in humor, see Arthur P. Hudson, *Humor of the Old Deep South* (New York, 1936).

³⁶ Reginald C. McGrane, *Foreign Bondholders and American State Debts* (New York, 1935).

³⁷ Benjamin Park to Lewis Hill, Sumter City, Alabama, July 8, 1853 (MS. in private hands).

³⁸ New Orleans *Daily True Delta*, February 6, 1850.

³⁹ Dwight L. Dumond (ed.), *Letters of James Gillespie Birney, 1831-1857*, 2 vols. (New York, 1938), I, 69.

⁴⁰ Charles S. Sydnor, *A Gentleman of the Old Natchez Region: Benjamin L. C. Wailes* (Durham, 1938), 6.

it is hardly safe to go from house to house."⁴¹ In the same year this paper carried a card for weeks offering a reward of \$500 for the arrest of the "party" who on several occasions had shot at the signer through the Cahaba hotel window.⁴² A city ordinance in Jacksonville, in the same state, prohibited the shooting of guns or pistols within two hundred yards of a dwelling. A schedule of fines for fights published in the Moulton *Democrat* in 1857 listed fist fights at from five to ten dollars, fights with sticks at twice as much, those with dirks at from twenty to thirty dollars, and those with bowie knives or pistols at from thirty to fifty dollars.⁴³ In twenty-three months of 1859-1860 the New Orleans chief of police arrested 62 persons for murder; 146 for stabbing with intent to murder; 734 for assault with deadly weapons; 42 for arson; 44 for burglary; 53 for highway robbery; 2,148 for larceny; 232 for swindling; 2,110 as suspicious characters; 47,403 for assault and battery, threats, and miscellaneous transgressions.⁴⁴

Conduct along other lines revealed the same frontier temper. A visitor in Georgia just after the Revolution described the people as "'the most prophane, blasphemous set . . . I ever heard of.'" She declared that she had seen groups of from fourteen to sixteen hundred assembled for public business "'and perhaps not one in fifty but what we call fighting drunk.'" ⁴⁵ Seargent Prentiss, writing of Mississippi in the early 1830's, said that "'intemperance, skepticism, profaneness,[and] gambling" were "sadly prevalent."⁴⁶ An Alabama obituary praised the deceased for "honesty and integrity . . . when sober,"⁴⁷ and Ingraham declared that whiskey was the favorite beverage of the Mississippi yeoman, "present[ed] to the stranger with one hand, while they give

⁴¹ Dallas *Gazette*, March 21, 1856. See, also, Frederick L. Olmsted, *A Journey in the Back Country* (New York, 1907), I, 143-44.

⁴² Dallas *Gazette*, October 12, 1855.

⁴³ Minnie Clare Boyd, *Alabama in the Fifties* (New York, 1931), 197.

⁴⁴ New Orleans *Daily Crescent*, June 18, 1860. On gambling and drinking in Mississippi, see [George L. Prentiss, ed.], *A Memoir of S. S. Prentiss*, 2 vols. (New York, 1856), I, 129-36.

⁴⁵ Ulrich B. Phillips, *The Life of Robert Toombs* (New York, 1913), 5.

⁴⁶ [Prentiss, ed.], *Memoir of S. S. Prentiss*, I, 130-31.

⁴⁷ Dallas *Gazette*, November 21, 1856.

him a chair with the other."⁴⁸ Reuben Davis admitted that his people "drank hard, swore freely, and were utterly reckless of consequences when their passions were aroused," but insisted that they were sober, reverent, and industrious. His version of the Mississippian's creed is as good a statement of the frontiersman's social attitudes as can be found:

A man ought to fear God, and mind his business. He should be respectful and courteous to all women; he should love his friends and hate his enemies. He should eat when he was hungry, drink when he was thirsty, dance when he was merry, vote for the candidate he likes best, and knock down any man who questioned his right to these privileges.⁴⁹

Religious expression in the early Southern West was also of the frontier brand. The itinerant preacher usually pioneered the way for the different evangelical denominations. The wanderings and deeds of a Lorenzo Dow in Mississippi differ little in essential detail from those of a Peter Cartwright in Illinois.⁵⁰ Both of these men would have agreed with the Georgian, who a few years earlier insisted that "larnin" made the preachers "proud and worldly" and that frontiersmen wanted "none of your new-fangled, high-flying preaching."⁵¹ Camp meetings flourished down to 1860 and men and women "got religion" after desperate struggles with the Lord and an undue amount of noise. A contemporary description of how Methodism won its way in the region would apply to all other denominations: "It lodged roughly, and it fared scantily. It tramped up muddy ridges, it swam or forded rivers to the waist; it slept on leaves or raw deer-skin, and pillowed its head on saddlebags; it bivouacked among wolves or Indians . . . but it throve."⁵²

The same frontier flavor characterized other lines of activity. Robert J. Walker and his Mississippi colleagues openly checked the bidding on government lands in the interest of their speculations⁵³ and an auctioneer in Alabama would "frequently stop crying the land" to suggest

⁴⁸ [Joseph H. Ingraham], *The South-West*, 2 vols. (New York, 1835), II, 172.

⁴⁹ Reuben Davis, *Recollections of Mississippi and Mississippians* (Boston, 1891), 18-19.

⁵⁰ *The Life, Travels, Labors, and Writings of Lorenzo Dow* (New York, 1851), 289-96; *History of Cosmopolite* (Philadelphia, 1815), 184-86, 214-18.

⁵¹ John D. Wade, *Augustus Baldwin Longstreet, A Study of the Development of Culture in the South* (New York, 1924), 64.

⁵² William E. Wightman, *Life of William Capers, D. D.* (Nashville, 1858), 471-72.

⁵³ *American State Papers, Public Lands*, VII, 495-96.

that buyers compromise and "quit fooling away your money."⁵⁴ It was an Alabama Senator who insisted that the squatters on the public domain were not "violators of the laws, and trespassers" but "meritorious individuals, because they have been the pioneers to all the new settlements in the West and Southwest."⁵⁵

Nor was democracy lacking. Thomas Dabney met sharp resentment when he attended the house-raising with his slaves in Mississippi and when he used them to help get a sick neighbor's cotton out of the grass. He was told that if he "had taken hold of a plough and worked" by the side of the unfortunate man all would have been well but to sit on his horse and direct Negroes was offensive even to those whose fields were benefited.⁵⁶ The same democratic spirit was shown in the constitutions of these Western states. In Alabama, Arkansas, and Texas all male white citizens were granted the right to vote and hold office without property or religious restrictions. In Mississippi where taxes or militia service was at first required for voting and the possession of property and religious faith for officeholding, a second constitution in 1832 wiped these out and added a most emphatic statement regarding the equality of all men.⁵⁷

This democratic flavor did not disappear in the ante-bellum period. The coming of the plantation crowded it aside only to about the same degree that economic and social maturity weakened frontier democracy in the North. Even in 1849 Albert Gallatin Brown could still win wide approval in Mississippi by the boast of being "entirely a self-made

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 479, 490, 496.

⁵⁵ *Cong. Debates*, 21 Cong., 1 Sess., 415 (May 5, 1830). For claims associations, etc., see Clarence E. Carter (ed.), *The Territorial Papers of the United States*, Vol. VI, *The Territory of Mississippi, 1809-1817* (Washington, 1938), 598-600, 632. Note also the support given to homestead and pre-emption legislation by Alabama and Mississippi representatives in Congress.

⁵⁶ Smedes, *A Southern Planter* (London, 1889), 67. See, also, Wade, *Augustus Baldwin Longstreet*, 5, 59, 61-64.

⁵⁷ Francis N. Thorpe (comp.), *The Federal and State Constitutions . . .*, 7 vols. (Washington, 1909), I, 89-114; IV, 2032-62. In speaking of social life in Alabama in the fifties, Miss Boyd says: "Social lines were indefinable then, as now. There was no perceptible division between slaveholders and non-slaveholders as classes. In marriage, in visiting, in professional or other employment no question was raised as to the ownership of slaves or interest in them." Boyd, *Alabama in the Fifties*, 214.

man' " and by accepting "every respectable man as his equal." When the good Dr. Duncan threatened to leave the South in 1860 because he could not approve of secession, the *Natchez Free Trader* informed him that

brains, not money; principles, not accidental position, rule the people of the South. England is the appropriate place for nabobs, where men bow humbly before Gessler's cap of money, and where lords are invested with every "virtue under heaven." But in the Southern States, men who make 4000 bales of cotton and own 500 negroes have not the influence on that account as the humblest mechanic who advocates correct principles.

A correspondent of this paper a decade earlier had insisted that the safety of the section lay with "her mechanics, her laborers, and her independence but not rich planters."⁵⁸ Evidently common men still believed in equality.

It might be possible also, I think, to show that slavery itself was affected by the move into the West. Just as the restless, nonconforming whites tended to get beyond the "hedge" and to drift ultimately to the West, so the rebellious, unsettled Negro found himself sold "down river." In early Western states the runaway advertisements in the newspapers are more numerous, the number of Negroes whose backs are scarred, ears cropped, and breasts branded much greater, indicating, I suggest, not only harder tasks to be performed in the wilderness, and a greater amount of homesickness, but also a habit of running away of long standing. Certainly there were more cases of assault on overseers and masters by slaves, more murders and, in turn, more lynchings of Negroes in the newer states than in the older ones. Slavery was less diffused, and the masters, as one slave complained, "more pushing." Paternalism weakened and the number of slaves whom the master had raised grew smaller. Talk of emancipation was seldom indulged in; the West gave the institution a new hold on the section.⁵⁹

It has been assumed by historians that truly Western conditions existed in the Southern region only in a very early period and that they

⁵⁸ James B. Ranck, *Albert Gallatin Brown, Radical Southern Nationalist* (New York, 1937), 60; *Natchez Free Trader*, September, 19, 1860; August 20, 1850.

⁵⁹ These conjectures are based on a rather comprehensive survey of Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana newspapers for the period.

passed abruptly with the coming of the plantation system. From that time forward, they say, all that was Western ceased to exist. "The South" came into being. In a recent textbook on the West in American history, Dan E. Clark insists that "the concentration on cotton production, with its accompaniment of slave labor, halted the process of frontier development that was normal in other sections." The "Old Southwest" knew the "backwoods pioneer" who "came and went as in other sections of the West," and the "small farmers" who enlarged the clearings. "But here the similarity ended. The cotton planters appeared upon the scene." Lands were exploited by a single crop and then abandoned while the planters moved on to newer regions, there to repeat the same process over and over again.⁶⁰ This procedure, says Professor Clark, prevented the completion of the cycle described by J. M. Peck in his *A New Guide for Emigrants to the West*. It missed the last stage in which "men of capital and enterprise" came, bought out the earlier settlers (who, by the way, had cleared the land) and began the development of towns, substantial buildings, "extensive fields, orchards, gardens, colleges and churches" and indulged in "broadclothes, leghorns, crapes and all the refinements, luxuries, elegancies, frivolities and fashions . . . in vogue."

Such an interpretation, and Clark is only the last to repeat it, furnishes only another illustration of the matchless efficiency of abolition propaganda. Historians are still repeating its charges. As a matter of fact the planter and the order which he established meet every requirement of the Peck formula from men "of capital and enterprise" to the "frivolities and fashions." Wheat was as much a single crop in the Northwest as cotton was in the Southwest and gave a depletion of soils which varied only as rainfall and character of sod formation differed. Every student of American agricultural history agrees on that point. Furthermore, the timber, mineral, or grass regions in the Northwest were treated in like fashion. There was nothing unique about what happened under cotton. Nor did the yeoman farmers cease to exist in the Lower South when a handful of planters settled among them. That class—and it did not differ in any essential way from the prosperous

⁶⁰ Dan E. Clark, *The West in American History* (New York, 1937), 307-308.

farming class of the Northwest—constituted an overwhelming majority in every Southwestern state to 1860 and increased its acreage and ownership throughout the ante-bellum period.

Furthermore, as nearly as can be determined, the great majority of planters in any given "black belt" were self-made men who achieved their planter status in a single lifetime. In the few regions studied it appears that a majority developed on the spot or came from older Western regions and did not migrate with plantations full-blown from the Atlantic seaboard. A more democratic story does not appear in American history than that offered by the rise of the planter and his large-scale effort in the Southwest. It is a story of hard-working pioneers who bought and sold land, moved along with population streams, and at last "made," as they described it, in some favorable corner. The number who had inherited capital and who brought "great resources" with them to the third stage of this West was no greater than that which came to the Northwest of the same period.

As to the rise of greater complexity in specialized services and in urban centers, it might be suggested that each plantation, something of a town in itself, supplied artisans, industrial laborers, and sometimes even "social workers," while Memphis, New Orleans, Mobile, and a sufficient number of inland towns furnished the commercial, financial, and professional groups. A closer study of the plantation system shows that planters often built their houses in village fashion and actually lived as urban dwellers. The plantation did not always scatter population. In fact, every significant feature of the third "normal western stage" was here to be found. It differed from that of the Northwest only as one West had a right to differ from another.

Thus both in detail and in flavor here was a new West. In essential qualities and temper it differed little from the other Wests of the day and offered the usual contrasts with the older areas from which it had sprung. It was Southern; yet it was thoroughly Western. Its institutions—political, economic, and social—were those of the Old South—the emphasis on county government and officials, the plantation and Negro slavery to a degree, the tradition to aristocracy. Yet the tone and outlook was as Western as that of Illinois—a bit more of indi-

vidualism and equality among men; more of waste and extravagance in the spending of Nature's gifts, more of optimism and more of resentment of privileges. Contemporaries recognized the differences and thought of the Cotton Kingdom as something quite distinct.

Furthermore the region early and late showed a mind of its own in regard to national policies. While the opposition to tariffs in principle and practice was general, the region staunchly supported Andrew Jackson in his stand against nullification. The offer of "treasure and blood" to "preserve inviolate our Constitution and our Union" made by an Alabama meeting, seems to have expressed the feelings of a great majority of the people.⁶¹ On land legislation, representatives of the Western Cotton Kingdom, such as Albert G. Brown, Clement Clay, Franklin Plummer, William R. Smith, Felix McConnell, and W. R. W. Cobb, were as staunch supporters of pre-emption and homestead bills as could be found in all the West. Most of them retained their liberal attitudes until well into the 1850's. And what is more significant, they were as sharply arrayed against the Old South in their land principles as they were against New England itself. For example: When a homestead bill came up for vote in the House, May 12, 1852, thirty-five representatives from the slaveholding states voted in its favor. Thirty of these were from the West. Of the thirty-four votes cast in opposition by the section, twenty-eight were from the seaboard. When the Senate refused to consider homestead legislation, February 21, 1853, twenty of the thirty-three senators who helped to block the bill were from the slaveholding states. Only three of them came from the new Southwest. Even in 1860, Brown of Mississippi could support homesteads with the declaration that he favored "land to the landless and homes to the homeless" regardless of whether they lived in the North or in the South.⁶²

East-West differences, moreover, were sometimes hidden by the

⁶¹ Albert B. Moore, *History of Alabama* (University, Ala., 1934), 219-20.

⁶² Ranck, *Albert Gallatin Brown*, 59, 135, 190; *Cong. Debates*, 23 Cong., 2 Sess., 1566-70 (Mar. 2, 1835); *Cong. Globe*, 32 Cong., 1 Sess., Appendix, 514, (April 27, 1852); 2 Sess., 747 (Feb. 21, 1853); 33 Cong., 1 Sess., 918 (April 14, 1854). For Brown's entire speech, see *ibid.*, 36 Cong., 1 Sess., 2007 (May 9, 1860). I am indebted to Mr. John L. Harr, one of my graduate students, for assistance in studying the attitudes of Southern congressmen on land legislation.

growing North-South hostility. The expansionist attitude of the Southwest under the pressure for a united front quickly overcame a disposition on the part of the older Southern states to think in terms of land and labor competition, and carried the section into the Texas-Mexican controversy almost as a unit. After a time another influence tended to obscure intra-Southern differences. The increase of political strength and economic resources through cotton gave the Gulf states increasing influence in the slavery struggle and added something more of aggressiveness and self-confidence to the Southern position. Then men talked of "The Cotton Kingdom" as though it constituted the whole South. They ignored dissenting voices. Only the Cotton Kingdom mattered. It thus came about that "King Cotton Diplomacy" was to have been the key to Southern success under Jefferson Davis of Mississippi.

It might thus appear that the Turner approach has a considerably wider application to the ante-bellum South than has usually been supposed. The course of developments was so orthodox that one may well pause in wonderment at the almost total neglect of its story in volumes dealing with "The West in American History." Yet the reasons both for neglect and for the shifting of emphasis to other factors are not difficult to understand. In the first place, the process of evolution from simplicity to complexity which Turner described never went beyond the agricultural stage in the South. The country-gentleman ideal, the development of peculiar marketing arrangements, and the presence of Negro slavery on plantations, checked the development of towns, factories, and industrial captains. The Old South and the Lower South, in spite of efforts to alter the situation, formed a rural-agricultural interest to the outbreak of the War between the States.

Added to this, the slavery controversy emphasized likenesses, not differences, between the old and the new portions of the South. Faced by critics from the outside who called slaveholding a crime and slaveholders, criminals, the whole South moved from resentment to fear. The race question came to form a bond of unity between planter and poor white, between the man from Virginia and the man from Texas.

The enormous variations, produced by major physical divisions, differing times and sources of settlement, competing economic interests, etc., were lost in a common fear of losing the white man's heritage. Sectionalism had characterized the early history of the South. Sectional differences of equal proportions now existed in Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas, and the foundations for sharp cleavage between the Old South and the Gulf states were ever-present and often active. Yet in spite of this, the force of the urban-industrial aggressions, soon reinforced by the attack on slavery, pounded these divergent Southern units into what appeared to be a great and distinct section. The normal working out of the Western process was thus hidden under a whole set of artificial creations, and the great American West, North and South, bound together by the Mississippi River system, split unnaturally into two parts. East and West on both sides of Mason and Dixon's line were forced into combinations with units which would normally have been their rivals. The West, therefore, ceased to act as a distinct unit in balancing national life, and failed to make its usual contribution to nationalism and democracy. What that cost the nation and its future no one can say.

Civil war came and ended. Propaganda and bloodshed added their part to sectional hatred. Reconstruction deepened the courses already sharply cut between the sections. Yet the Confederacy, with its capital moved to Richmond, was scarcely able to hold together even in war days, and the so-called "Copperhead" movement in the Northwest constantly threatened the security of Lincoln's government. And when the war and its aftermath had been over long enough to again permit passion to yield to interest, the major truth which stared the American people in the face was that the urban-industrial Northeast had emerged triumphant over all rural-agricultural rivals, and had begun an alliance with the Bourbon elements in the older Southern states for the expansion of their capital and influence to that region. Cotton and wheat farmers of the prewar Wests, North and South, might, hereafter, protest but the power to change things, as earlier Wests had done, had forever passed. That may some day be considered one of America's greatest tragedies.

The Effects of the Civil War on the Louisiana Sugar Industry

By WALTER PRICHARD

Sugar was first successfully manufactured in Louisiana in 1795, and by 1803 it had become the staple crop on a limited number of plantations near New Orleans. Protected by tariff after 1803, sugar culture made notable advances before 1812, when the higher war tariff and the blockade, with resulting increased prices, gave additional stimulus to the industry. The culture of sugar expanded up the Mississippi to Pointe Coupée and westward along bayous Lafourche and Teche in the decade following the importation of hardier varieties of cane and the introduction of steam mills in the early 1820's. The annual yield advanced from 30,000 hogsheds in 1823 to 88,000 in 1828, which figure was not exceeded until 1834, when the crop reached 100,000 hogsheds. Low cotton prices following the panic of 1837, and a more favorable sugar tariff after 1842, resulted in the extension of cane culture to the highlands above Baton Rouge, to the level prairies of the Attakapas and Opelousas regions, and along Red River as far as Natchitoches by the middle 1840's. Many cotton plantations were converted to sugar during the two decades preceding the Civil War, some of the finest ante-bellum sugar plantations being located in this new sugar area. Better drainage and more adequate levee protection against overflows, improved methods of cultivating the cane, more powerful mills for grinding, and more efficient processes of manufacture, kept pace with the rapid expansion of the area of cane culture; and, in spite of numerous handicaps, the

Louisiana sugar industry continued to flourish until almost annihilated by the blight of civil war.¹

The average annual sugar crop jumped from 77,000 hogsheads for the decade 1832-1841, to 192,000 for the decade 1842-1851, and to 298,000 for the decade 1852-1861. Unfavorable climatic conditions and other unavoidable hazards brought occasional lean years, and the crop fluctuated widely, ranging from 30,000 to 115,000 hogsheads in the decade 1832-1841, from 100,000 to 248,000 in the decade 1842-1851, and from 74,000 to 460,000 in the decade 1852-1861. The crop of 1861 reached 459,410 hogsheads, valued at \$25,000,000, which exceeded the bumper crop of 1853 by 10,000 hogsheads and slightly surpassed in value the crop of 1858.²

The outbreak of the Civil War found this great industry still advancing, though it had already attained a remarkable status, in spite of tariff uncertainties, climatic disadvantages, flood menaces, and other se-

¹ This brief summary of the ante-bellum sugar industry is based upon information accumulated during fifteen years of research, the bibliography of which it would be manifestly impracticable to cite here in its entirety. Statistics given are from P. A. Champomier's annual *Statement of the Sugar Crop Made in Louisiana* (New Orleans), 1844-1845, 1845-1846, 1849-1850 to 1861-1862; New Orleans *Price-Current*, 1822-1862; *De Bow's Review* (New Orleans, 1846-1880), I-XXXII (1846-1862).

Champomier's work gives the sugar crops for the years covered, by plantations and parishes, listing the location of each plantation, the type of sugarhouse, and the kind of equipment employed in each. It is a veritable mine of information on the history of the ante-bellum sugar industry. P. A. Degelos issued a few similar annual reports previous to the beginning of the Champomier *Statements*, but extant copies of Degelos' reports are exceedingly rare, and summaries only of most of his reports are to be found in the newspapers of the 1830's, particularly in the New Orleans *Price-Current*. This paper was an outstanding organ of the commercial and agricultural interests of Louisiana, and a vast amount of information on the sugar industry is found in its files. The "Annual Statement," published at the beginning of each commercial season, usually in the issue of September 1, gives a detailed resumé of the sugar crop of the preceding year. *De Bow's Review* devoted a great deal of space to articles and statistics on the sugar industry, but a considerable part of the material printed by it, particularly the statistics of the sugar crop, are derived directly from Champomier's *Statements* or from the *Price-Current*. Both the New Orleans and the Louisiana country newspapers devoted considerable space to this major interest of ante-bellum Louisiana.

² Hogshhead statistics are computed from the "Table of Annual Yields," in Champomier, *Statement*, 1861-1862. Annual yields for 1823 to 1861, except for the years 1830 and 1831, are also in *Report of the Commissioner of Agriculture for the Year 1869* (Washington, 1870), 57. Value of sugar crops are from *De Bow's Review*, After the War Series, II (1866), 416. All subsequent references to this periodical are to this series.

rious hazards which the best management was powerless to eliminate. The percentage of juice extracted from the cane had been gradually increased, the amount of sugar derived from a given quantity of juice had been greatly augmented, the quality of sugar manufactured was improved, and the quantity of molasses per hogshead of sugar was considerably decreased. Only 264 of the 1,291 sugarhouses operating in 1861 employed horsepower, the other 1,027 being operated by steam; and many of the progressive planters had installed the latest and most approved apparatus for the manufacture of sugar.³

In 1861 the Louisiana sugar industry represented an investment of \$200,000,000, divided as follows: 1,291 sugarhouses with their equipment and other permanent plantation improvements, \$56,000,000; lands, \$26,000,000; rolling stock, mules, horses, oxen, wagons, carts, and agricultural implements, \$13,000,000; and 139,000 slave families, \$105,000,000. Many single sugarhouses represented an investment of \$100,000; over 1,000 of them averaged \$50,000, while the remaining 300 averaged \$20,000 in value. The average value of the 1,291 sugar estates was \$155,000, while several were valued at over \$1,000,000 each.⁴ These huge sums invested in sugar culture explain why the uninformed Northern opponents of the sugar tariff commonly referred to the sugar planters as the "Sugar Nabobs of Louisiana."⁵ The sugar industry in 1861 thus presented an impressive record of past progress, a most strik-

³ See Champomier, *Statement*, 1861-1862, p. 39, for information on types of motive power for operating sugarhouses, and his several annual *Statements* for the progress of improvement in apparatus for manufacturing sugar.

⁴ Figures from letter of Edmund J. Forstall of New Orleans to David A. Wells, special commissioner of the revenue, printed in full in New Orleans *Price-Current*, May 19, 1866. Statistics contained in this letter are also in *De Bow's Review*, II (1866), 304-306. See, also, *Report of the Commissioner of Agriculture for the Year 1874* (Washington, 1875), 108.

Forstall was a prominent ante-bellum sugar planter and a keen student of the sugar industry. Probably none of his contemporaries was better informed than he on that subject; and, discounting his probable bias in favor of a Louisiana industry, his figures may be accepted as substantially correct. At any rate they are the best available on the capital invested in the sugar industry at the outbreak of the Civil War and the losses sustained by that industry as a result of the war.

⁵ Numerous instances of the use of this favorite epithet are found in the speeches of Northern congressmen during the tariff debates between 1830 and 1860.

ing example of man's successful conquest of an unfavorable natural environment, in the face of apparently insurmountable obstacles.⁶

Let us now turn to the effects of the Civil War on this great industry. The bumper crop of 1861 was cultivated to maturity, harvested, manufactured, and marketed with little interference from war activities;⁷ and all preparations for another huge crop had been made before Federal armies invaded Louisiana's "sugar bowl" in the spring of 1862. Demoralization of plantation Negroes, who regarded Federal troops as their liberators, and the seizure of plantation animals for army use, prevented adequate cultivation of the crop. Scarcity and undependability of labor, shortage of plantation animals, wagons, and carts, wanton destruction of sugarhouses or disabling of their machinery by Federal soldiers or irresponsible Negroes, lack of fuel and necessary chemicals, and the generally unsettled conditions incident to the war, rendered impossible the orderly harvesting and manufacture of the crop, and much cane was left to rot in the fields.⁸ These unfavorable condi-

⁶ *De Bow's Review*, IV (1867), 236-38; *Report of the Commissioner of Agriculture for the Year 1877* (Washington, 1878), 240.

⁷ Shortage of extra labor during the grinding season retarded the harvesting and manufacturing of the crop, but the season was extremely favorable and little loss occurred on account of labor shortage. Employment of steamboats in war activities rendered transportation of the crop to market difficult in some instances. Some planters suffered from lack of adequate fuel for sugar manufacture on account of difficulty in obtaining new supplies of coal, but on the whole this factor was of minor importance. The blockade, both on the Mississippi and in the Gulf of Mexico, greatly limited the normal market for Louisiana sugar, thus depressing the price of the article. *De Bow's Review*, II (1866), 416.

⁸ For general effects of the war on the sugar crop of 1862 and subsequent years, see Forstall to Wells, in the *New Orleans Price-Current*, May 19, 1866; *De Bow's Review*, I (1866), 49; IV (1867), 236-38. For shortage of plantation wagons and carts, see *New Orleans Times*, November 7, 1865. For shortage of plantation animals, see *New Orleans Bee*, February 20, 1863; *New Orleans Era*, March 18, April 11, 1863; *New Orleans Times*, February 13, March 13, December 28, 1864; January 21, February 5, 24, April 2, June 8, October 1, 15, 20, 28, December 27, 1865; January 24, 26, 1866; *New Orleans Daily True Delta*, August 24 (quoting *Franklin Planters' Banner*, August 19), 1865. On shortage of fuel, see *New Orleans Era*, December 15, 1863; *New Orleans Daily True Delta*, August 26, November 11, 1864; February 14, 1866; *New Orleans Daily Crescent*, February 19, 1865. On scarcity of chemicals employed in sugar manufacture, see *New Orleans Bee*, January 1, 1863; *New Orleans Era*, October 18, 1863; *New Orleans Times*, November 13, 1864; November 23, 1865. On scarcity of sugar hogsheads and molasses barrels, see *New Orleans Bee*, January 8, November 4, 27, 1863; *New Orleans Era*, January 24, March 20, October 3, 18, 1864; January 9, 27, February 24, June 12, October 1, November 4, 7, 1865; March 16, 1866. Examples of wanton destruction of sugarhouses are noted in *De*

tions combined to reduce the crop of 1862 to 87,000 hogsheads, valued at only \$8,000,000.⁹

The inability of the sugar planters to save the crop of 1862 had far-reaching results destructive to the industry. Sugar planters as a class were capitalists, operating largely upon credit advanced by their factors, who in turn discounted this plantation paper with the banks. In 1862 the Louisiana sugar planters owed some \$20,000,000 to their New Orleans factors.¹⁰ Thus, the greatly reduced crop of that year ruined planters, factors, and banks alike, and made impossible the financing of another sugar crop, had no other obstacles prevailed. In 1864 only six or seven out of over five hundred ante-bellum New Orleans factors remained in business, and most of the banks were ruined by the events of the war.¹¹

With credit annihilated and labor unreliable, many planters despaired of making another sugar crop, and turned to other crops requiring less labor and capital. Attracted by the high prices then prevailing, many planters tried the cultivation of cotton. On account of the blockade, some planted only crops for home consumption. Rice culture was greatly extended in the sugar regions, and corn and vegetables were cultivated on a larger scale than in ante-bellum days. The war, which had cut off supplies from the outside, resulted in greater diversification of crops in the sugar region. A "live at home" policy was generally adopted by sugar planters.¹² Under these conditions little seed cane was planted in

Bow's Review, II (1866), 538; *New Orleans Daily True Delta*, March 8, June 26, 1863; December 23, 1864; August 24, 1865; *New Orleans Era*, November 1, 1863; *New Orleans Times*, September 17, 20, November 18, 1865. Citations on demoralization of the plantation labor resulting from invasion of the sugar regions by Federal armies will be given in connection with labor conditions at the close of the war.

⁹ *De Bow's Review*, I (1866), 49.

¹⁰ Forstall to Wells, *New Orleans Price-Current*, May 19, 1866; *De Bow's Review*, II (1866), 416.

¹¹ *New Orleans Daily True Delta*, September 30, 1864.

¹² On diversion of sugar lands to other crops, see *New Orleans Era*, September 1, December 3, 1863; *New Orleans Times*, January 14, 1864; *New Orleans Daily True Delta*, June 11, 15, July 10, September 30, 1864; February 9, March 14, April 4, 1865. For the increase in rice production in Louisiana resulting from the effects of the war, see Louis Bouchereau, *Statement of the Sugar and Rice Crops Made in Louisiana* (New Orleans, 1868-1877), 1868-1869, *et seq.*; *Report of the Tariff Commission, Appointed Under Act of Congress Approved May 15, 1882*, 2 vols. (Washington, 1882), II, 2537-41.

1862, and most of the sugar crop of 1863 was produced from the ratoons. Some planters sold their standing cane in the field, on account of their inability to command the labor and capital necessary to manufacture their crops into sugar. In spite of all these difficulties the sugar crop of 1863 yielded 77,000 hogsheads, which at the high prices then prevailing was valued at \$14,000,000.¹³

Few planters tried to make a sugar crop in 1864. Many even plowed up what cane they had and planted cotton, rice, or some other crop requiring less labor and capital than sugar culture.¹⁴ The ratoons, which had produced most of the crop of 1863, were running out, and little or no seed cane was planted to replace them.¹⁵ Many planters were so discouraged that they planned to grind what little cane they had and then abandon the culture entirely. The future outlook for the sugar industry was then so serious that General Nathaniel P. Banks ordered all sugar planters to reserve one fourth of their cane crop of 1864 for seed.¹⁶ This requirement reduced the amount of cane available for making sugar, thus bringing the crop of 1864 down to 10,000 hogsheads, valued at only \$2,000,000, in spite of the prevailing high prices for sugar.¹⁷ This small yield was hardly sufficient to supply the needs of New Orleans, and much Cuban sugar was imported for local consumption.¹⁸ The meager crop of 1864 was produced by only 175 sugarhouses located in sixteen parishes, which in 1861 had 1,090 sugarhouses in operation, producing 400,000 hogsheads. Eight other sugar parishes, which in 1861 had 201 sugarhouses in operation, making 60,000 hogsheads, made no sugar at all in 1864.¹⁹ The Louisiana sugar industry was at its lowest ebb at the beginning of 1865.

When preparations should have been made for the sugar crop of

¹³ *De Bow's Review*, I (1866), 49; II (1866), 416.

¹⁴ See n. 12, above.

¹⁵ *De Bow's Review*, I (1866), 49; II, (1866), 416.

¹⁶ General Orders, No. 138, dated New Orleans, September 22, 1864, published in full in *New Orleans Daily True Delta*, *New Orleans Times*, and *New Orleans Era*, September 28, 1864.

¹⁷ *De Bow's Review*, I (1866), 49; II (1866), 416.

¹⁸ *New Orleans Daily True Delta*, May 24, June 18, 26, July 7, August 2, 1864.

¹⁹ Figures compiled from table in the "Annual Statement," in *New Orleans Price-Current*, September 1, 1866.

1865, the war was still on, plantation labor was scarce and unreliable, credit facilities were lacking, and the planters were discouraged; and when the war closed it was too late in the season to expand the sugar crop of that year. Thanks to General Banks' seed cane order, more cane was cultivated in 1865 than in 1864, but much of the crop of that year was reserved for seed, the demand for which was unusual.²⁰ Cotton prices dropped sharply after the war closed, the lowlands of the sugar regions had proved unsuited to cotton, and there was a rush to return to sugar culture as soon as possible.²¹ Many planters found it more profitable to sell their cane crop of 1865 for seed, the price of which had advanced to \$150 per arpent.²² Had labor and capital been available and the price of seed cane not been almost prohibitive, it is possible that all the crop of 1865 might have been planted rather than manufactured into sugar. Many planters also made only molasses in that year, in order to escape the Federal excise tax of three cents per pound on sugar.²³ Under these conditions only 188 sugarhouses were in operation in 1865, producing 18,000 hogsheads, valued at only \$3,000,000, with the drop in sugar prices following the war.²⁴

Before considering the movement to revive the prostrated sugar industry, it may be enlightening to view the war losses sustained by that interest. These losses, exclusive of lands and slaves, were estimated at \$70,000,000. Figures previously cited place the slave loss at \$105,000,000. Louisiana lands depreciated in value more than those of any other

²⁰ On the great demand for seed cane for the crop of 1865, see *New Orleans Times*, September 23, 29, October 1, 8, 12, 27, November 13, 1864; January 12, 1865; *New Orleans Daily True Delta*, February 10, 11, 1865.

²¹ *New Orleans Daily True Delta*, September 30, October 1, 1864; February 9, March 15, April 4, 1865.

²² *New Orleans Times*, August 6, 8, September 7, 8, October 1, November 9, December 27, 1865; *Carrollton Daily Southern Star*, October 1, November 16, 1865; *New Orleans Bee*, November 8, 1865.

²³ For the heavy burden which this excise tax imposed upon the sugar industry, see *De Bow's Review*, I (1866), 658; *New Orleans Era*, June 16, 1863; *New Orleans Daily True Delta*, June 17, 1863; March 17, 1866; *New Orleans Times*, July 10, 31, 1865; March 17, 1866; *Carrollton Daily Southern Star*, March 18, 1866; *New Orleans Price-Current*, February 21, 24, May 19, 1866.

²⁴ "Annual Statement," in *New Orleans Price-Current*, September 1, 1866; *De Bow's Review*, II (1866), 416.

Southern state between 1860 and 1865, the decrease being estimated at 70 per cent, making a loss of \$18,000,000 on sugar lands. These losses make a total of \$193,000,000 on an investment of \$200,000,000, amounting to almost complete annihilation.²⁵ Every sugar planter who could held on tenaciously to his ruined estate, hoping to rebuild his shattered fortune.²⁶ But many sugar plantations had been heavily mortgaged at the outbreak of the war, and when the war ended a general liquidation ensued. Sugar plantations sold as low as from 6 to 10 per cent of their prewar value, many bringing less than the original cost of their sugarcane machinery, and far less than the proceeds of their sugar crop of 1861. Many formerly opulent sugar planters were dispossessed and financially ruined, their plantations passing into new hands, the purchasers acquiring the neglected lands and dilapidated buildings and equipment for a small cash outlay.²⁷

Planters fortunate enough to retain their estates found their sugar-houses and machinery destroyed or rendered useless by vandalism or the ravages of the elements during the years of disuse and neglect; plantation ditches filled up or overgrown with weeds, briars, and shrubs; drainage machines destroyed or useless until repaired; levees broken in many places and requiring extensive repairs before a crop could be planted with safety; plantation fences missing, consumed as firewood by Federal soldiers or Negroes; plantation animals gone, and rolling stock and agricultural implements missing or worn out; existing buildings in a disheartening state of disrepair; and the part of the ante-bellum labor force remaining on the plantation demoralized and

²⁵ The decrease in land values in the Southern states after 1860 is estimated at 70 per cent for Louisiana, 65 per cent for Mississippi, 60 per cent for Alabama and South Carolina, 55 per cent for Georgia, Florida, and Arkansas, 50 per cent for North Carolina, 28 per cent for Texas, 27 per cent for Virginia, and 18 per cent for Tennessee, in *Report of the Commissioner of Agriculture for the Year 1867* (Washington, 1868), 119. Detailed information on depreciation in Louisiana is found in *ibid.*, 106, 114, and in *De Bow's Review*, III (1867), 474.

²⁶ "The Planter is yet holding tenaciously to his wrecked Estate, destitute of the means to work it." Forstall to Wells, in *New Orleans Price-Current*, May 19, 1866.

²⁷ For a few representative sales of fine sugar estates after the war, see *New Orleans Daily True Delta*, April 28, May 13, 1865; February 14, 1866; *New Orleans Times*, March 13, 1866; *New Orleans Price-Current*, September 1, 1865; *De Bow's Review*, III (1867), 308.

rendered irresponsible by the effects of the war and the Freedmen's Bureau regulations.²⁸ It took a stout heart to undertake the rehabilitation of a plantation reduced to such a ruined condition.

But a surprising note of optimism was prevalent among sugar planters at the close of the war. They were inclined to look toward the future rather than to pine for the good old days.²⁹ Two factors were essential to the rehabilitation of their plantations: capital and labor. The former was almost unprocurable immediately after the war. The little local capital available was absorbed by the reviving commerce of the region. Banks preferred to lend their limited capital on short-term commercial

²⁸ For information on the demoralized condition of the sugar industry at the close of the war, see *New Orleans Times*, March 26, April 2, 28, May 30, June 1, 12, 27, 29, July 6, 10, 15, 18, 23, August 5, 12 (quoting *St. Martinville Courier of the Teche*), 16, 30, September 6 (quoting *Franklin Planters' Banner*), 17, 20, October 9, 15, 27, November 18, 23, 1865; *New Orleans Bee*, March 25, August 29 (quoting *Plaquemine Iberville South*), September 12, 26, December 28 (quoting *Baton Rouge Advocate*), 1865; *New Orleans Daily True Delta*, January 25, March 15, July 22, August 11 (quoting *St. Martinville Courier of the Teche*), 24 (quoting *Franklin Planter's Banner*), December 28 (quoting *Baton Rouge Advocate*), 1865; *New Orleans Price-Current*, July 21, September 1, October 4, 7, 11, 21 (quoting *Pointe-a-la-Hache Empire Parish*), December 23 (quoting *Pointe Coupée Echo*), 1865; *Carrollton Daily Southern Star*, September 7 (quoting *Franklin Planters' Banner*), October 8, December 29 (quoting *Baton Rouge Advocate*), 1865; *West Baton Rouge Sugar Planter*, March 24, April 21, September 22, October 20, 27, 1866; *De Bow's Review*, I (1866), 49; II (1866), 416; III (1867), 170; IV (1867), 474; V (1868), 461; *Report of the Commissioner of Agriculture for the Year 1867*, pp. 100-101; 1874, p. 108; 1877, pp. 34-44; Randell Hunt, *An Appeal in Behalf of Louisiana, to the Senate of the United States, for the Fulfillment of the Constitutional Guarantee to Her of a Republican Form of Government, as a State in the Union* (New Orleans, 1874), 6-7; Theodore S. Wilkinson, *The Sugar Question, with Certain Allegations on the Subject Considered. . . . Speech . . . in House of Representatives, Monday, July 9, 1888* (Washington, 1888), 6.

The country editors took the lead in the publication of articles on the condition of the sugar industry following the war, and most of the New Orleans editors gleaned their information from their country exchanges, though some of them had firsthand knowledge of conditions. The ablest of the country editors was Daniel Dennett of the *Franklin Planters' Banner*. After its revival, following the close of the war, the *West Baton Rouge Sugar Planter*, edited by Henry M. Hyams, lived up to its name by devoting a large amount of space to conditions of the sugar industry. Other country editors did their bit in the attempt to encourage rehabilitation of the Louisiana "Sugar Bowl." Complete or even partial files of very few of these post-bellum country papers are extant, and the chief source for information published in most of them is excerpts copied by the contemporary New Orleans papers. The material available on this large subject is voluminous, and only selected samples of it are cited here.

²⁹ For evidences of this optimism of sugar planters immediately following the war, see *Carrollton Daily Southern Star*, November 16 (quoting *Franklin Planters' Banner*), 22

paper. This type of credit was unsatisfactory to sugar planters, who must have long-term credit, which was obtainable only at interest rates ranging from 10 to 15 per cent, with real estate at greatly reduced valuations as security. Such credit was not available to many planters, and they were forced to proceed slowly in their rehabilitation operations, working largely on a cash basis, which was their only recourse under existing circumstances.³⁰ It was estimated in 1865 that \$26,000,000, if made available at once, would enable sugar planters to resume cane culture on a small scale: \$13,000,000 to replace plantation animals, rolling stock, agricultural implements, sugarhouse equipment, etc., and \$13,000,000 as advances for labor and supplies necessary in making a sugar crop. An appeal was made to the Federal government for a loan of the above sum, but the appeal met with no response.³¹ The ruined sugar interest had little attraction for private capitalists as a field for safe investment. Inability to procure needed capital delayed the recovery of the sugar industry.³²

The solution of the labor problem was another obstacle confronting

(quoting Houma *Civic Guard*), 1865; January 26 (quoting Franklin *Planters' Banner*), February 5 (quoting Franklin *Planters' Banner*), 20 (quoting West Baton Rouge *Sugar Planter*), 24 (quoting Plaquemine *Iberville South*), 1866; New Orleans *Times*, November 19, 1865 (quoting Franklin *Planters' Banner*); February 19, 1866 (quoting Franklin *Planters' Banner*); New Orleans *Price-Current*, November 25 (quoting Franklin *Planters' Banner*), December 23 (quoting Franklin *Planters' Banner*), 1865; West Baton Rouge *Sugar Planter*, October 13, 20 (quoting Plaquemine *Iberville South*), 27, November 10, 1866.

³⁰ On scarcity of local capital and the general derangement in banking and credit facilities at the close of the war, see New Orleans *Times*, July 10, September 6 (quoting Franklin *Planters' Banner*), October 27, November 23, December 3, 6, 31, 1865; January 1, 1866; Carrollton *Daily Southern Star*, September 7, 1865 (quoting Franklin *Planters' Banner*); New Orleans *Price-Current*, September 1, 1865; September 1, 1866; "Reports of the Majority and Minority of the Financial Commission of New Orleans, under Special Orders No. 69, Issued by Major General N. P. Banks, Commanding Department of the Gulf, under Date of March 18, 1864," in *Report of the Auditor of Public Accounts to the General Assembly of the State of Louisiana, September 30, 1864* (New Orleans, 1864); "Report of the Attorney General," in *Legislative Documents of Louisiana, 1864*, pp. 195-200; "Report of the Board of Currency," *ibid.*, 218-20.

³¹ For estimate of capital needed immediately to rehabilitate the sugar industry, and appeal to the Federal government for an advance of this amount, see Forstall to Wells, in New Orleans *Price-Current*, May 19, 1866.

³² *De Bow's Review*, I (1866), 220; IV (1867), 236-38; V (1868), 882; Robert M. Davis, *The Southern Planter, the Factor and the Banker* (New Orleans, 1871); *Report of the Commissioner of Agriculture for the Year 1873* (Washington, 1874), 109-11.

the sugar planters. At first they hoped to find a way to utilize the free labor of their former slaves in sugar culture.³³ Contrary to accepted tradition, Negroes who were accustomed to cane culture preferred it to cotton culture.³⁴ But if a steady and dependable labor supply could not be had, the revival of cane culture on the ante-bellum scale was not possible. When planters undertook, in the fall of 1865, to make contracts with freedmen for 1866 the "forty acres and a mule" idea was abroad, and the Negroes refused to make contracts.³⁵ The state legislature took steps to make labor available to the planters, but this legislation aroused the ire of the uninformed Northern radicals, which caused the plan to fail.³⁶ Even if it had been possible to restore to the plantations all Negroes accustomed to sugar culture in ante-bellum days, the labor supply would still have been far short of the demand, on account of the great

³³ On the experiences of sugar planters with free Negro labor, see *New Orleans Bee*, February 20, 1863; September 26, 1865; *New Orleans Era*, April 2, 11, December 3, 5, 15, 25, 1863; *New Orleans Times*, February 16, 25, June 1, July 23, September 20, 1865; February 19, 1866 (quoting *Franklin Planters' Banner*); *New Orleans Daily True Delta*, August 11, 1865; *Carrollton Daily Southern Star*, October 8, November 22, December 14, 1865; *New Orleans Price-Current*, October 21, 1865; *Opelousas Courier*, January 27 (quoting *Baton Rouge Advocate*), February 17 (quoting *New Orleans Daily True Delta*), 1866; *West Baton Rouge Sugar Planter*, March 10, 1866; *De Bow's Review*, I (1866), 220; II (1866), 436-39; III (1867), 100-101, 200-201, 332-33; VI (1869), 85-92; VIII (1870), 168-69; report of Carl Schurz who visited the Louisiana sugar region in the fall of 1865, *Senate Executive Documents*, 39 Cong., 1 Sess., No. 2, pp. 84-88, 92-96; "Report of P. H. Sheridan, Major General United States Army, to Major General O. O. Howard, Commissioner, &c., Washington, D. C., dated Headquarters Bureau Refugees, etc., State of Louisiana, New Orleans, Louisiana, October 31, 1866," *ibid.*, 2 Sess., No. 6, pp. 70-72, 74, 84-87.

³⁴ *West Baton Rouge Sugar Planter*, October 13, 20 (quoting *Plaquemine Iberville South*), 1866; *De Bow's Review*, I (1866), 659.

³⁵ On the reluctance of freedmen to make contracts and their inefficiency and undependability when they were employed, see *New Orleans Daily True Delta*, September 1 (quoting *Baton Rouge Gazette and Comet*), October 13 (quoting *Thibodaux Sentinel*), 1863; January 23, 1864; *New Orleans Bee*, October 14, 19, November 10, 1863; *New Orleans Era*, October 17 (quoting *Thibodaux Sentinel*), November 8, 1863; November 22, 1864; *New Orleans Times*, April 28, June 29, 1865; *Carrollton Daily Southern Star*, December 14, 1865; January 18 (quoting *Houma Civic Guard*), February 24 (quoting *Plaquemine Iberville South*), 1866; *De Bow's Review*, III (1867), 332-33; VI (1869), 85-92; VIII (1870), 168-69; "Report of P. H. Sheridan," in *loc. cit.*, 84-88; report of Carl Schurz, in *loc. cit.*, 84-88.

³⁶ For the movement to regulate the labor of freedmen by statute, see *New Orleans Price-Current*, November 4, 11, 22, 25, December 2, 20, 1865; January 6, February 24, 1866. For the text of these laws to regulate freedmen, commonly called the "New Black Code," see *Louisiana Laws*, Extra Sess., 1865, Nos. 10, 11, 12, 16, 19, 20, pp. 14-20,

mortality among the Negroes during the war.³⁷ Until the freedmen learned that their freedom meant "freedom to work" it was unsafe to rely upon this type of labor for sugar culture, and the planters turned their attention to schemes for inducing white laborers from the North and West and from Europe to come to the sugar regions. The Louisiana State Bureau of Immigration, established in 1866, and numerous private and corporate agencies took up the work. But the Northern press was hostile at this time, the sugar regions had a false reputation for insalubrity, and the free lands and the expanding industries of the West and North had greater attractions than the cane fields of Louisiana for white laborers. A small number of German, Irish, and other immigrants were procured, but on the whole the plan to supplant the Negro with white labor on the sugar plantations was not a success.³⁸

24-26, 28-32; *Acts of the General Assembly of Louisiana, Relating to Labor, Extra Session, 1865, Printed by Order of the House of Representatives* (New Orleans, 1866). The latter reference also contains Act No. 58, which was not approved by the Governor. This proposed act, which was the most obnoxious of the lot to the Northern radicals, was included along with the others in the report of O. O. Howard, major general and commissioner, to E. M. Stanton, secretary of war, on "Freedmen's Affairs," dated Washington, December 21, 1866, in *Senate Executive Documents*, 39 Cong., 2 Sess., No. 6, pp. 181-87. For Louisiana's defense of these measures to regulate freedmen, see "Report of the Senate Committee on Federal Relations," and "Report of the Commissioners Appointed by the General Assembly to Proceed to Washington, to Wait on Andrew Johnson, President of the United States," in *Legislative Documents of Louisiana*, 1866.

³⁷ New Orleans *Times*, November 19, 1865 (quoting *Franklin Planters' Banner*); New Orleans *Price-Current*, December 30, 1865; *De Bow's Review*, IV (1867), 236-38; VI (1869), 85-92.

³⁸ On the movement for inducing white laborers to come into the sugar regions, the activities of the Louisiana Bureau of Immigration, and private agencies in this work, see New Orleans *Bee*, February 1, 1864; November 25, December 4, 7, 1865; New Orleans *Times*, April 9, September 1, 28, 1864; May 30, June 12, July 24, August 16, October 5, 15, November 23, December 29 (quoting *Franklin Planters' Banner*), 1865; January 24, February 10, March 14 (quoting *Franklin Planters' Banner*), 1866; New Orleans *Daily True Delta*, August 9, 26, September 28, 1864; March 15, 1865; Carrollton *Daily Southern Star*, December 5, 20 (quoting *Franklin Planters' Banner*), 29 (quoting *Franklin Planters' Banner*), 1865; West Baton Rouge *Sugar Planter*, February 10, October 27 (quoting *Franklin Planters' Banner*), 1866; *De Bow's Review*, I (1866), 213-14; II (1866), 274-85; IV (1867), 468-76, 575-76; V (1868), 211, 297-308, 327-29, 363-72; VIII (1870), 154; "Report of the Auditor of Public Accounts," in *Louisiana Legislative Documents*, 1864, Appendix, "Report of State Officers," 84; "Communication from His Excellency, J. Madison Wells, Governor of Louisiana, in Relation to Immigration, and the Establishment of a Bureau of Arts and Agriculture in Connection Therewith," in *Legislative Documents of Louisiana*, 1866; *Report of Thomas Cottman, Chief of the Bureau of Immigration for the State of Louisiana* (New Orleans, 1866); *Report of the Bureau*

The planters next turned to plans for bringing coolies from India and China to the Louisiana sugar regions. Quite a number of coolies were brought in, and they were regarded as steady and dependable laborers.³⁹ But the ensuing struggle of the Negroes for political and social equality made it seem undesirable to import other inferior races to complicate further the already troublesome race problem confronting the whites of Louisiana. Moreover, when the freedmen learned that the "forty acres and a mule" donation expected from the Federal government was not forthcoming, many of them returned to plantation labor and were again the chief reliance for a labor supply on the sugar plantations,⁴⁰ except during the harvest season, when additional white laborers were employed to assist in taking off the crop.

of Immigration to the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, 1867 (New Orleans, 1867); "Annual Report of J. C. Kathman, Chief of the Bureau of Immigration, to the General Assembly of Louisiana, July 1, 1868," in *Legislative Documents of Louisiana, 1868*; "Report of the Bureau of Immigration to the General Assembly," *ibid.*, 1869; "Memorial and Explorations of the Hon. J. B. Robertson, in Relation to the Agricultural, Mineral, and Manufacturing Resources of the State; with the Report of the Joint Committee," *ibid.*, 1867, reprinted in "Report of the Bureau of Immigration, 1868; Report of Edward Gottheil, Chief Commissioner and General Agent from the State of Louisiana to the Paris Universal Exposition of 1867, Made to the Governor and General Assembly, Session of 1868," *ibid.*, 1868; *The Louisiana Immigration and Homestead Company: Reasons for Subscribing, and Charter of the Association* (New Orleans, 1873); *Circular of Messrs. John Williams and Charles Nathan* (New Orleans, 1880), offering to contract with planters to bring in European farm labor; H. Thompson Brown, *Ascension Parish, Louisiana; Her Resources, Advantages and Attractions: A Description of the Parish and the Inducements Offered to Those Seeking New Homes* (Donaldsonville, 1880), "Prepared at the Instance of the Ascension Branch Sugar Planters' Association of Louisiana, and Published by the Police Jury of Ascension Parish"; *Resources of Vermilion Parish, Southwest Louisiana, Issued by the Louisiana Land and Development Company, Ltd., Abbeville, Louisiana* (New Orleans, 1894). William H. Harris, *Louisiana: Produkte, Ressourcen und Attraktionen* (New Orleans, 1885), is an example of immigration literature designed to attract Germans to the sugar regions. Harris was commissioner of immigration for Louisiana. *Lands and Plantations Belonging to the Citizens' Bank of Louisiana, Offered for Sale or Rent on Favorable Terms* (New Orleans, 1876), is a good example of private appeals to those interested in settling in the sugar regions.

³⁹ On importation of coolies into the sugar region and experiments with such labor, see *New Orleans Times*, June 27, July 6, 1865; *Opelousas Courier*, December 9 (quoting *New Orleans Picayune*), 16 (quoting *New Orleans Bee*), 23, 1865; February 17, 1866 (quoting *Franklin Planters' Banner*); *West Baton Rouge Sugar Planter*, February 10, 1866; *De Bow's Review*, I (1866), 224; II (1866), 215-17; IV (1867), 160, 362-63; VI (1869), 525; VII (1869), 630; *Report of the Commissioner of Agriculture for the Year 1873*, p. 109.

⁴⁰ On the return of the freedmen to the sugar plantations, see Carrollton *Daily Southern*

But hired labor, of whatever type, proved more expensive than antebellum slave labor in sugar cultivation, and planters were forced to adopt new methods of cultivation in order to reduce their labor costs. Confronted with this pressing problem the sugar planters largely abandoned the hoe culture, which had been a striking feature of the antebellum gang system, and introduced mule-drawn, laborsaving agricultural implements.⁴¹ They also turned their attention to better drainage of their lands, crop rotation, more careful selection of seed cane, and the use of commercial fertilizers, in order to increase the yield of cane per acre. One of the chief items in the cost of cane culture was the labor employed in tending the crop, and it cost no more to cultivate an acre of rank cane than an acre of scrawny cane. Thus, in the course of time sugar planters largely overcame the postwar handicap of scarcity of plantation hands and the higher cost of free labor.⁴²

Star, December 20, 1865 (quoting *Franklin Planters' Banner*); *New Orleans Daily True Delta*, December 29, 1865; *New Orleans Price-Current*, October 25, December 23 (quoting *Franklin Planters' Banner*), 1865; *West Baton Rouge Sugar Planter*, March 31, April 21, 1866.

⁴¹ For abandonment of hand tillage and the introduction of laborsaving equipment for cultivating the cane, see "The Cultivation of Sugar Cane and the Manufacture of Sugar," in *American Sugar Manual* (Buffalo, 1870), 26, a circular of the American Cane Machinery, manufactured by George L. Squier & Brother. Lack of capital for purchasing improved equipment and the fact that the Negroes were accustomed to hoe culture and did not take readily to the use of improved equipment retarded progress in this respect.

⁴² For improvement in sugar agriculture by adoption of better and more scientific methods in growing sugar cane, see *Report of the Commissioner of Agriculture for the Year 1867*, pp. 279-80; 1869, pp. 297-98; 1873, pp. 109-11; 1877, pp. 21-24; 1878, p. 7; 1886, p. 330; 1889, pp. 527-28; 1891, pp. 517-18; 1892, pp. 19, 151; *De Bow's Review*, VI (1869), 517-25; VII (1870), 100, 500-502; Guilford L. Spencer, "Report of Experiments in the Manufacture of Sugar at Magnolia Station, Lawrence, Louisiana, Season of 1885-'86: Second Report," in Department of Agriculture, Division of Chemistry, *Bulletin No. 11* (Washington, 1886); Louis Bouchereau, *Statement of the Sugar and Rice Crops Made in Louisiana, 1868-1877*; Alcée Bouchereau, *Statement of the Sugar and Rice Crops Made in Louisiana* (New Orleans, 1877-1892), 1877-1878, *et seq.*; *Proceedings of the Louisiana Sugar Planters' Association* (New Orleans, 1885-1889), published as pamphlets and reports, but its activities are found earlier in New Orleans newspapers before regular *Proceedings* were printed; *Louisiana Planter and Sugar Manufacturer* (New Orleans, 1888-1929). This last publication appeared weekly and was the official organ of the Louisiana Sugar Planters' Association, Ascension Branch Sugar Planters' Association, Louisiana Sugar Chemists' Association, Kansas Sugar Growers' Association, and the Texas Sugar Planters' Association. The Bouchereau *Statements* and the official organs of the Sugar Planters' associations are the most reliable sources for the study of rehabilitation and progress of the post-bellum sugar industry.

As necessary capital was slowly accumulated the planters also attacked the problem of expressing from the cane the maximum quantity of juice, and of manufacturing the maximum quantity and the best possible quality of sugar from a given amount of cane juice. More powerful mills were installed in the sugarhouses by all the more progressive planters, and the vacuum pan, the centrifugal, and other improved equipment was utilized in the manufacture of sugar.⁴³ But only a planter of wealth could afford the enormous outlays for such equipment, and the small sugar planter began to turn his attention to sugar agriculture, thus leaving the manufacture of sugar to the capitalist who owned and controlled the expensive manufacturing equipment. This and other changes in the sugar industry gradually brought about the almost complete separation of the agricultural from the manufacturing phase of sugar production, which is a striking feature of the Louisiana sugar industry today.⁴⁴

One of the chief obstacles to the revival of sugar culture immediately following the war was the bad condition of the levees, on which the sugar planters depended for protection of their crops against inundation. To repair the crevasses then existing, an expenditure of at least \$625,000 was required. The planters were unable to stand this expense, and the ante-bellum system of holding each abutting plantation owner responsible for maintenance of the levees in front of his property was now untenable. Maintenance of the levees was recognized as a state problem and in 1866 the state relieved the planters of this heavy burden. The Federal government was requested to repair the damage done to the

⁴³ For the progress of improvement in sugar manufacture by introduction of better machinery and employment of more scientific methods, see authorities cited in n. 42, above; *Report of the Commissioner of Agriculture for the Year 1873*, pp. 109-11; 1884, pp. 12, 34-42; 1885, pp. 11, 123-38; 1886, pp. 18, 327-41; 1887, pp. 254-81; 1888, pp. 24, 249, 253-54, 263-64, 273-78; 1889, pp. 19-20, 149-51, 162; 1890, pp. 15, 294, 511.

⁴⁴ On the movement for dividing the great sugar estates into small farms, and the gradual separation of sugar agriculture from sugar manufacture, see authorities cited in ns. 42, 43, above; *De Bow's Review*, III (1867), 332-33; IV (1867), 236-38; V (1868), 882; VII (1870), 108-109; *American Sugar Manual*, 1870, p. 3; *Report of the Commissioner of Agriculture for the Year 1869*, p. 435; 1878, p. 275; William C. Stubbs, *A Hand-Book of Louisiana, Giving Geographical and Agricultural Features, Together with Crops That Can be Grown . . .* (New Orleans, 1895).

Louisiana levees by the Federal armies, but the request was denied, and it was not until 1882 that the Federal government lent a hand in levee maintenance and flood control. Until Federal assistance was forthcoming the state struggled with the levee problem, more of the funds appropriated for the purpose doubtless going into the pockets of corrupt Carpetbag politicians than into actual levee construction.⁴⁵

In view of the many difficulties confronting the sugar planters it is truly remarkable that the industry was rehabilitated as rapidly as it was, particularly when the political strife of Carpetbagger reconstruction days, which kept the freedmen in a state of unrest and retarded the investment of outside capital in the sugar industry, is considered. Sugar planters were for a decade left mainly to their own resources, but their inherent courage and indomitable spirit gradually brought results. The number of sugarhouses in operation jumped from 175 in 1864 and 188 in 1865 to 329 in 1866, 653 in 1867, 673 in 1868, 817 in 1869, 1,105 in 1870, and 1,224 in 1873. The number then began to decline because of the proven inefficiency of the smaller ones, the absorption of smaller plantations by larger ones, and the advent of the movement for establishing central sugar factories, with the progress of the separation of the agricultural from the manufacturing phase of the industry.⁴⁶

⁴⁵ On the levee problem in general and the effect of bad levees upon the rehabilitation of the sugar industry, see *Report of the Board of Levee Commissioners, Together with Reports of the Chief Engineers of the First and Second Division Louisiana Levees* (New Orleans, 1866); also in *Legislative Documents of Louisiana*, 1866; "Report of the State Engineer," *ibid.*, 1867; *Annual Report of the Board of Levee Commissioners to the Legislature of the State of Louisiana* (New Orleans, 1867); "Memorial to the Legislature by the Board of Levee Commissioners on the Employment of Convict Labor," in *Legislative Documents of Louisiana*, 1867; *Report of the Board of Levee Commissioners of the State of Louisiana, from May 10, 1867, to July 27, 1868* (New Orleans, 1868), containing also as an appendix, pp. 55-70, "Acts of the Legislature in Relation to the General Levee System," comprising fourteen laws passed between December 22, 1865, and June 29, 1867, illustrating the volume of such legislation after the war; *Louisiana Laws, passim*, for texts of levee laws; *De Bow's Review*, III (1867), 469-73; V (1868), 162-67; VIII (1870), 170; *Report of the Commissioner of Agriculture for the Year 1869*, p. 56; 1877, pp. 28-29; 1878, pp. 275-76; 1879, pp. 6-7; *New Orleans Times*, April 2, October 9, 1865; *New Orleans Price-Current*, October 4, 7, 11, 1865; *Carrollton Daily Southern Star*, December 31, 1865; *West Baton Rouge Sugar Planter*, 1866-1870, *passim*. Other Louisiana newspapers of the period contain many articles on the levee problem. For an exact computation of losses to sugar planters from high waters and crevasses in certain years, see Alcée Bouchereau, *Statement of the Sugar and Rice Crops Made in Louisiana in 1881-82*, xliii, xlvi.

⁴⁶ Statistics on sugarhouses for years given are compiled from *De Bow's Review*, I

Scarcity of capital following the war led sugar planters to make a trial of the so-called portable mills, which had come into such wide use in the sorghum industry in the North. The number of such establishments in operation grew from eight in 1868 to ninety in 1871, after which the number gradually decreased. The number of horsepower mills also increased from 133 in 1868 to 317 in 1871, and then gradually decreased, cane growers finding it more profitable to sell their cane to the more efficient sugarhouses. Open kettles for boiling the cane juice gradually gave way to open pans, and then to vacuum pans.⁴⁷

At the close of the war there was much talk of breaking up the large sugar estates into smaller tracts, on the basis of the "forty acres and a mule" idea. Experienced sugar planters opposed this scheme, and held that it was as impracticable to try to rehabilitate the sugar industry by dividing the sugar lands into small tracts as it would be to expect a New England cotton manufacturer to make as large a product by operating a number of "one-horse" mills as by concentrating the same amount of capital and labor in one central establishment. There was the problem of maintenance of an expensive levee system, the responsibility for the extensive drainage system, and the large capital investment in the sugar-house on the plantation. It was maintained that a number of small proprietors would be unable to co-operate successfully in sugar culture and manufacture. While there were a few cases of division of the large sugar plantations into small tracts, the consummation of this plan on a large scale had to await the establishment of central sugarhouses in the second decade after the war, when the agricultural and manufacturing phases of the sugar industry began to be separated.⁴⁸

With the progress of the industry under the impulse of the innovations previously mentioned, the sugar yield moved steadily upward following the war, though with considerable fluctuations, from 18,070 hogsheads in 1865 to 41,000 in 1866, 84,256 in 1868, 144,881 in 1870,

(1866), 201; II (1866), 417; IV (1867), 239; Louis Bouchereau, *Statements*; "Annual Statements," in New Orleans *Price-Current*, September 1, 1870; September 1, 1871.

⁴⁷ Statistics from Louis Bouchereau, *Statements*. Also given in *Report of the Commissioner of Agriculture for the Year 1876* (Washington, 1877), 157.

⁴⁸ Louis and Alcée Bouchereau, *Statements*. Also authorities listed in n. 44, above.

169,331 in 1876, 218,314 in 1880, and 241,220 in 1882. It continued to increase until it reached 476,379 hogsheads in 1893—when the yield for the first time exceeded the bumper crop of 1861—and 568,622 in 1894, which was the largest crop produced before the turn of the century.⁴⁹ The average crops for the three decades following the end of the war were: 1866-1875, 98,000 hogsheads; 1876-1885, 188,000; and 1886-1895, 345,000. It is thus seen that the average yield for the decade 1866-1875 was 21,000 hogsheads greater than that for 1832-1841; that of 1876-1885 was 4,000 less than that for 1842-1851; and that of 1886-1895 was 47,000 greater than that of 1852-1861.⁵⁰ This period of three decades following the Civil War had brought many changes in the sugar industry while it was undergoing the process of rehabilitation. The bumper crop of 1894 was produced by only 449 sugarhouses, only three of which were operated by horsepower; and only 72 sugarhouses used open kettles in that year, 143 open pans, while the number employing vacuum pans had increased to 234.⁵¹

In conclusion it may be stated that the Civil War almost annihilated the Louisiana sugar industry, and the lack of available capital and the scarcity of labor seriously retarded its rehabilitation. But, building upon ante-bellum experience, the industry staged a slow but gradual comeback, and by the time the annual production had again attained the pre-war level the cultivation of the cane and the manufacture of sugar were both managed on a more scientific basis. It seems certain that the results of the third decade following the war might have been attained at the end of one decade, had not the turbulent days of reconstruction intervened.

⁴⁹ Statistics of crops for 1865 and 1866 are from *De Bow's Review*, II (1866), 417; IV (1867), 239; those for 1868, 1870, and 1876 are from Louis Bouchereau, *Statements*; and those for 1880 and subsequent years are from Alcée Bouchereau, *Statements*. Figures for latter years are given in pounds instead of hogsheads, and these have been converted into hogsheads to make them conform with the figures for the earlier years.

⁵⁰ Averages for decades preceding the war are calculated from figures in Champomier, *Statement of the Sugar Crop Made in Louisiana, 1844-1862*; those following the war are computed from sources listed in n. 49, above.

⁵¹ Alcée Bouchereau, *Statement of the Sugar and Rice Crops Made in Louisiana in 1894-'95, passim*.

Cultural Factors in the History of the South

By RICHARD H. SHRYOCK

Interpretations of general history or of historical sociology¹ may proceed in terms of three major factors which influence the life of any people; namely, their biological nature, the particular culture they possess, and the physical environment in which they find themselves.² Each of these determinants, the biological, the cultural, and the geographical, is logically distinct from the others and together they seem to represent the only fundamental factors which are so distinct, unless one has faith in such forces as individual caprice or direct supernatural influence. It is possible to view other traditional interpretations of history as resolving themselves into an emphasis upon special phases of one of these factors, or else as involving a combination of two or more of them. Thus a stressing of religious influences may be viewed as featuring one aspect of cultural determinism; while an economic interpretation combines elements of a cultural and of a geographical nature. Again, any special theme which has been employed as a "guiding thread" through the historical maze—for example, nationalism, colonialism, democracy, the frontier—may be broken down into these more fundamental elements.³

¹ This paper was read at a meeting of the Southern Historical Association at New Orleans, November 4, 1938.

² It is not desirable to stress the traditional distinctions between history and historical sociology, which frequently do not appear historically accurate or logically sound. Indeed, both history and sociology have suffered because of their isolation, one from the other, and there now seems a tendency for thoughtful scholars in each field to converge to some extent upon common social problems. See Harry E. Barnes and Howard Becker, *Social Thought from Lore to Science*, 2 vols. (New York, 1938), I, 750 ff.

³ It should be noted in passing that we are dealing here with such "interpretations" of history as any historian commonly employs, as distinct from the more general "philosophy" (Hegelian, Darwinian, etc.), within the framework of which any but the most extremely

It might be well, then, to abandon such guiding threads in favor of the three major determinants as integrating principles in historical synthesis. Or, what amounts to the same thing, we might employ such complex themes as nationalism or colonialism only in so far as we distinguish carefully between the several elements which might be involved in each case. The integration here suggested could be applied equally well to any special phase of history, including "social history" in the narrow sense—which is often criticized as lacking in cohesion—and applies equally well to any given people.

When it is said that biological, cultural, and geographical determinants represent the logical limits within which every general historical interpretation must be elaborated, there is no intention to oversimplify the matter. That these limits are by no means narrow will be obvious enough when it is recalled that a given historical phenomenon may be traced to any one of these factors, or to two or three of them operating simultaneously and in varying degrees.⁴

The story of early Virginia, for instance, may conceivably be stated in terms, first, of the biological nature of the settlers—perhaps their race or their particular class; second, of the ideas, arts, and institutions which were their cultural heritage; and third, of the geography of the tidewater area. Each presumably interacted with the others. If the settlers were inherently a superior people—let us say "Nordics" or "Cavaliers"—this must have enabled them to make more of the English cultural heritage than an inferior race could have done. Yet even the best people were certain to be conditioned in their subsequent history by the physical environment. Nor should we forget that this environment, in

empirical interpretations have to be worked out. See the chapter "Ideas in History," in Allan Nevins, *The Gateway to History* (New York, 1938).

⁴ Geographical and biological determinants are of a relatively simple nature, in the sense that both involve relationship between culture and a factor external to it. What is here called the "cultural determinant" is, of course, an enormously complex thing to be described in terms of internal relationships. In dealing with this theme alone the historian must, if he is to be more than a pure empiricist or the unconscious victim of whatever theory is "in the air," work out or accept some theory of these internal relationships. See, for example, the analysis in Pitirim Sorokin, *Social and Cultural Dynamics*, 2 vols. (New York, 1937), I, 13 ff.

turn, was likely to be modified by Englishmen and by English culture. The colonists laid hold of Virginia geography in a manner quite beyond the aborigines. The proudest of the native peoples could never have stripped the top soil from the tidewater region with the effectiveness which marked even the most obscure of the tobacco farmers.

It is the constant action and reaction of all three types of determinants, as just suggested, which make the picture of historical causation so confusing. The primary purpose of most thoughtful historians has naturally been to find some method for simplifying it. The picture must apparently be abandoned as too complicated to have meaning; or else it must be redrawn by the historian's art in such a manner as to feature one phase and to give perspective to the whole. Only in this way may one produce an historical panorama, inviting to the eye and not demanding too much of the imagination.

First of all, the picture may be abandoned by questioning the whole concept of causation. It may be held that close priority of one historical event to another—let us say, the firing on Fort Sumter and Lincoln's first call for volunteers—does not mean that the one "caused" the other. The two phenomena may be mere "concomitant variations" in space-time relationships, and these latter references themselves but categories of the pure reason. Or one may say that while various events have a logical relationship, none can be isolated as "causes" of the others. Such views have the advantage of eliminating the whole baffling problem of what caused what in history and are no doubt intellectually impressive, but they are somewhat disconcerting to anyone who wishes to construct an historical narrative. Without the concept of cause, it is difficult to achieve continuity and without this quality historical writing takes on a mystical or fragmentary nature.

Most historians, therefore, have assumed that one could paint a picture of causation, and that to make this meaningful one had to provide foreground and background—one of the major determinants must be pushed to the front and the others into the dim distance. Lest all this seem a bit figurative, consider illustrations of how this has actually been done by those writing on the history of the South. Indeed, this

may afford a perspective on the history of American history which is not usually emphasized by those who write on the subject.⁵

Our early historians assumed, as a matter of course, that cultural heritage exerted the major influence upon the first settlements. Both Governor William Bradford and Captain John Smith viewed their people as Englishmen who were planting and preserving English culture—or certain phases of that culture—in America. The plain truth is that the majority of settlers did not “go native,” even in the first years, as they would have done had the frontier environment overwhelmed them; and it is consequently no wonder that the earliest writers adopted the view just noted. The same attitude is apparent in eighteenth century Southern writers. The historian David Ramsay was so conscious of the unity of American and European culture that, when asked to explain the status of the medical sciences in Charleston in 1800, he did so by reviewing the history of these sciences in Europe during the preceding century.⁶

As one comes further down in Southern historiography, there is encountered the popular ante-bellum view that a cavalier tradition had dominated early Virginia—in contrast to the bourgeois background of New England—and from Virginia had spread out and given tone to Southern life in general. This view expressed the sectional feeling of the time in the prevailing romantic manner, but we are not so concerned here with its origins as with the fact that this again illustrates the prevailing assumption; namely, that the cultural traditions first established in the South played a predominant role in the subsequent development of the section. It is of small moment whether or not we find this attitude in men who called themselves historians; the point is rather that it was common among many who talked or wrote about the South and its past.⁷

⁵ It is not emphasized, for example, in Michael Kraus, *History of American History* (New York, 1937). See Charles A. Beard and Alfred Vagts, “Currents of Thought in Historiography,” in *American Historical Review* (New York, 1895-), XLII (1937), 463 ff.; and Carl Becker, “What is Historiography?” *ibid.*, XLIII (1938), 20 ff.

⁶ David Ramsay, *A Review of the Improvements, Progress and State of Medicine in the XVIII Century* (Charleston, 1800).

⁷ For example, J. H. Van Evrie, M.D., *Negroes and Negro “Slavery”* (New York, 1861), 271, 272.

The same sectional tension which fostered the cavalier tradition also encouraged another fundamental type of interpretation. This was the biological, in the form of an elaborate doctrine of racial controls. Those who are astonished by the racial interpretation now current in Germany would do well to recall its former vogue in this country. It is sometimes forgotten that during the two or three decades prior to the Civil War, a "school" of American writers—chiefly Southern anthropologists and medical men—elaborated the thesis that the white and Negro races were distinct species of separate origin. The Negro was pronounced inherently and therefore permanently inferior; and his history in Africa, in the West Indies, and in the United States was explained upon these grounds. Particularly interesting was the interpretation of developments in Haiti and Jamaica and of the record of the mulatto class in the United States itself. It was claimed, for example, that nine tenths of all the crime committed in this country by "so-called negroes" had really been the work of mulattoes—a fact of considerable interest to social historians if it could be substantiated.⁸ This in turn was assumed to prove a racial determinant, although today it would probably be ascribed to social circumstance. The evidence upon which this thesis was based was by no means fanciful, and in the opinion of a present authority was indeed the best available to the biology and anthropology of the day.⁹

It is also of some interest, in passing, to note that American anthropologists who believed in a permanent distinction between races did some work upon the American Indian as well as upon the Negro. This interest can be traced back at least as early as Benjamin Rush's essays of the late eighteenth century. Rush was well known abroad, and from then on there was some give-and-take between European and American anthropologists. One finds that the British authority,

⁸ *Ibid.*, 167.

⁹ William S. Jenkins, *Pro-Slavery Thought in the Old South* (Chapel Hill, 1935), 273 ff. It will also be recalled that a more moderate emphasis upon racial factors, not clearly distinguished from the cultural, was implied in the assumptions about Anglo-Saxon Protestant superiority which were expressed by such American historians as John Fiske, John W. Burgess, and John B. McMaster late in the nineteenth century. See Kraus, *History of American History*, 337, 383, 394.

J. C. Pritchard, cited Rush; Pritchard in turn was cited by Samuel B. Morton of Philadelphia; and both Pritchard and Morton were subsequently used by Arthur de Gobineau in his famous essay on racial inequality. Since Morton was closely associated with Josiah Nott, G. R. Gliddon, and other Southern racial theorists, it is possible that this American "school" ultimately influenced Gobineau and therefore contributed something to the basis of contemporary European views on racial determinism.¹⁰

Meanwhile, the collapse of slavery after the Civil War removed the immediate motive which had encouraged racial interpretations in the United States, although such views doubtless survive more or less unconsciously in the thought of many Americans. The impact of Darwinian doctrine upon biology also discouraged racial determinism. The particular theory of the origin of species, which was first advanced by William C. Wells of Charleston¹¹ and finally established fifty years later by Charles Darwin, denied that separate origin and permanent distinction between races which was essential to the Southern racial theories. Hence scientific as well as political developments discouraged the survival of such views as a serious mode of thought in this country.

As one approaches the end of the nineteenth century, it is apparent that critical Southern writers were not only abandoning biological theories, but that they were also losing interest in cultural interpretations as well. There were several reasons for this. Although a romantic and nostalgic temper survived long among post-bellum Southern novelists and their readers, it tended to break down earlier among Southern historians trained in Northern seminars. Thus the cavalier tradition was rejected for lack of evidence in able studies which Thomas J. Wertenbaker and others made of the settlement of Virginia. Indeed, it was high time that this tradition should be abandoned even in the interest

¹⁰ J. C. Pritchard, *Physical History of Mankind* (3rd ed., London, 1836), 133; Arthur de Gobineau, *The Inequality of Human Races*, trans. by A. Collins (New York, 1915), 185 n. My attention was called to this element in Gobineau by my colleague, Dr. Richard H. Heindel.

¹¹ Richard H. Shryock, "William Charles Wells," in *Dictionary of American Biography*, 20 vols. and index (New York, 1928-1937), XIX, 644-45. Wells was especially, perhaps exclusively, concerned with the origin of what he considered human species.

of pro-Southern feeling, since it had long since been turned against the section by Northern critics. If Southerners could view New Englanders as bourgeois or even plebeian in origin, the latter could and did view Southern beginnings in terms of convicts and servants, or at best as the work of so-called gentlemen of a most indifferent sort.

Polemics of this nature were as superficial in one section as in the other; but there was a special reason for the Southern desire to abandon them in our own day. It became increasingly apparent that economic and cultural difficulties in the South, while caused in part by the Civil War, had actually set in before that struggle and might indeed be viewed as a cause as well as an effect of the same.¹² Southern historians naturally found it difficult to explain such things in terms of cavalier ancestors, nor would their critical standards permit ascribing everything to the machinations of Yankee exploiters. There was all too much truth in this last thesis—witness its recent revival by Walter P. Webb and others—but clearly not the whole truth. There must be some other explanation of this old story.

It was quite natural, under the circumstances, to turn to the third major determinant for possible enlightenment. It is questionable whether geographical factors in American history had ever been properly recognized prior to about 1890, although they were doubtless noted at times in relatively obscure writings. Thus a member of the racial school, John Campbell of Philadelphia, argued in 1850 that geographical circumstances were even changing the biological make-up of Europeans in America¹³—a view revived with more exact data by Franz Boas in our own time.

The present emphasis upon geographical determinism in history was encouraged by the studies of human geography made by Henry T. Buckle and others, and applied to American history by Nathaniel S. Shaler, Ellen Semple, and their contemporaries.¹⁴ Somewhat indepen-

¹² See the well-known analysis in Robert R. Russel, *Economic Aspects of Southern Sectionalism, 1840-1861*, University of Illinois Studies in the Social Sciences, XI, No. I, Pts. I, II (Urbana, 1923).

¹³ John Campbell, *Negro-Mania* (Philadelphia, 1851), 216 ff.

¹⁴ See Arthur M. Schlesinger, *New Viewpoints in American History* (New York, 1922), 45.

dently Frederick J. Turner, conscious of the neglect of geographical factors by American historians, wove them along with certain other strands into his frontier thesis.¹⁵ It is no disparagement of Turner or his followers to suggest that they may naturally have welcomed this theory as one lending significance to their own section, the Middle West, just as New England historians had long been impressed by interpretations complimentary to their portion of the country.

Southern historians found the new geographical emphasis quite acceptable, although for somewhat different reasons than those which may have influenced their Western colleagues. If the basic economic difficulties of the Old South had been forced upon it by stern geographical necessity, there was no reason for blaming these troubles upon either the original settlers or their descendants. The classic expression of this recent geographical interpretation of Southern history is probably the eloquent opening paragraph of Ulrich B. Phillips' *Life and Labor in the Old South*, which begins with the weather and then by brief, necessarily connected steps, carries us inevitably into so complex and remote a consequence as the American Civil War.

It is doubtful if any thoughtful historian would question today that Turner, Phillips, and other Western and Southern historians have performed a most valuable service to our historiography in recognizing the importance of geographical factors. The revision of earlier interpretations resulting therefrom has been enlightening and suggestive, and will undoubtedly remain a permanent element in subsequent investigations. Yet it is quite in order to pose the question: Have those who emphasize geographical determinism—like those who earlier supported other "schools"—already carried their thesis to a point where it needs modification in the interest of the other major determinants? This query was raised here and there more than a decade ago with reference to Turner and the Western historians, and has recently swelled into a considerable chorus.¹⁶

¹⁵ Fulmer Mood, "Turner's Formative Period," in *Early Writings of Frederick Jackson Turner* (Madison, Wis., 1938), 33 ff.

¹⁶ See, especially, the suggestive essays (pro and con) by Avery O. Craven, John D. Hicks, and B. F. Wright, Jr., in Dixon R. Fox (ed.), *Sources of Culture in the Middle West* (New York, 1935).

In a paper read last year, the writer attempted to present the same question with regard rather to Southern historians, and to note the evidence which would seem to call for a return to cultural approaches in studying the history of the South.¹⁷ This did not imply any desire to claim all things for the cultural heritage. In fact, an effort was made to find a way out of the recurring swing from one extreme of interpretation to another—that pendulum phenomenon which in history or any other field is apt to indicate a low level of scientific procedure.

The way out suggested was that we should try to determine the relative influence of one of the major determinants as compared with another, by seeking some historical situation in which the one factor seemed a constant and the other a variable. In this way, we might approach (even though we could not fully realize) those conditions of laboratory experiment which have proved so fruitful in the natural sciences. The particular illustration suggested in this connection was the contrast afforded by the agricultural and social history of British and German farmers who settled in similar regions of Pennsylvania and the Old South—in a word, an historical setting in which cultural heritage was a variable but the geographical environment a more or less constant factor.

A tentative study of this subject seemed to indicate that the cultural factors played a greater role in Southern agricultural origins than has recently been accorded them. Cumulative data indicated that the Germans, during the eighteenth century, almost universally held a reputation for superior farming; and that this superiority was due in large measure to such cultural equipment as the ability to select better lands, superior techniques, and a considerable aversion to slavery. Conversely, the cultural background of the English settlers of Virginia made for a less happy selection of land, inferior technique, and a dependence upon

¹⁷ A paper read before a joint session of the American Historical Association and the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, in Philadelphia, December 30, 1937. An unauthorized and partial version was subsequently published in the *American-German Review* (Philadelphia, 1935-), IV (1938), 36 ff., presumably for other purposes than my own, but the complete paper appeared in *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (Cedar Rapids, 1915-), XXVI (1939), 39-54.

slave labor. The resulting contrast between the intensive, diversified, free-labor farming of the German-Americans and the extensive, money-crop, slave-labor system of the Anglo-Americans, was apparent in similar areas and even in such identical regions as central Maryland and North Carolina.¹⁸

There is no occasion to repeat here the evidence considered in an earlier study, but one further question might well be raised; namely, how long was the cultural contrast noted maintained in a common environment? It is conceivable that such differences might have proved very temporary, until environmental forces "ironed them out" into a common American way of life. Had this actually occurred, that is, had the Germans lost their folkways and traditions within a generation, the process would not necessarily have been due to any geographical influences. It might be viewed simply as a process of cultural exchange, during which the Germans contributed a few things to the English-speaking majority—say a taste for pretzels and for good music—while they took over most of the prevailing heritage. In a word, Americanization may at first have been little more than a process of Anglicization carried on in America.

Whatever one thinks of such reasoning, the plain truth is that the Americanization of the early Germans—the so-called Pennsylvania Dutch—was an extremely slow affair. In consequence, their particular cultural heritage remained for a long period, and to some extent still remains, a significant influence in the areas in which they originally settled. More than a century after they first cleared their lands in Pennsylvania, Virginia, and North Carolina, one finds just the same comments on their agriculture as were noted during the Colonial period. Thus Harriet Martineau, a keen and critical observer, wrote of them about 1835:

There is one certain test of the permanent fitness of any district of country for agricultural purposes; the settlement of any large numbers of Germans in it. They are much smiled at by the vivacious and enterprising Americans for their plodding, their attachment to their own methods, and the odd direction taken

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

by their pride. . . . Nothing can be more thriving than the settlements of Germans.¹⁹

Here one has the old report of agricultural superiority, plus a comment on the persistence of culture patterns despite the disdain of the English-speaking majority. The latter were still engaged in "getting rich quick" at the expense of posterity; while the German-Americans continued to get rich slowly to the benefit of those who came after them.

It should be added here, for the sake of clarity, that neither of the peoples under consideration were exempt from geographical influences. The land-labor ratio, just the reverse in America of that in the old countries, always tempted settlers to adopt extensive, inferior farming procedures. These apparently paid better at the time. Miss Martineau made some interesting observations in this connection also. She noted that in her day English immigrants at first attempted an intensive cultivation of American farms. (She was speaking of actual farmers, who had presumably benefited by the agricultural revolution in the mother country.) But, she added, the Englishman after a few seasons "learns that he has got to a place where it answers to spend land to save labour; the reverse of his experience in England; and he soon becomes as slovenly a farmer as the American and begins immediately to grow rich."²⁰ In a word, while the "plodding" Germans resisted this geographical temptation almost indefinitely, English settlers of the nineteenth century—like their compatriots of an earlier age—could withstand it for but "a few seasons."

The significance of this contrast for the long-range history of the South is obvious enough. If the subject has been correctly presented, the difficulties of the section were not entirely determined by soil and climate but turned in part on the type of people who exploited these resources. The Anglo-Americans proved to be the sort who could use them best to immediate advantage, the German-Americans a type who

¹⁹ Harriet Martineau, *Society in America*, 2 vols. (New York, 1837), I, 297, 298; see, also, 340. My attention was called to these references by my former student, Miss Nannie Tilley of the Duke University Library.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 338.

could improve them for posterity. The dominance of the former group and their customs was at least one major factor in bringing on agricultural difficulties, continued colonial dependence, colonial protests, and, finally, a second war for independence—in about that chronological order. Here again is what Professor Phillips would have termed a “house that Jack built,” but one with a different foundation from that which he described.

This perspective on Southern developments has implications for world history as well as for our own. As far as it goes, it presents the British settlers of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries as people poorly adapted for the colonization of agricultural regions. The general success of their empire has perhaps blinded us to this fact—a success apparently due to maritime and manufacturing skills. The English, like any other people, naturally did best in regions to which their particular gifts were well adapted. In New England, for example, their seafaring ability saved the day. This very maritime success, however, finally gave them control of the world’s seaways and colonies, and may have indirectly discouraged Continental peoples from settling great open areas like Canada, Australia, and our own South. It seems probable that Continental peasants were better adapted to such regions than were the English unemployed. But German and Italian governments had no colonies to which to send their farmers, while the Dutch and French lost their holdings after English victories. All this suggests that the pride which both Englishmen and Americans have taken in Anglo-Saxon colonization, as well as the disdain they have sometimes felt for Spanish and German attempts in the same direction, is due for a thorough overhauling.²¹

So much, then, for an illustration of cultural variables studied against the background of a common environment. Historians, for various rea-

²¹ Recall, for example, the expressions of such pride in Theodore Roosevelt, *Winning of the West*, 6 vols. (New York, 1900). The labors of our Latin-American historians have already made for greater appreciation of Spanish accomplishments; while Georg Friederici’s recent work, *Der Charakter Der Entdeckung und Eroberung Amerikas Durch Die Europäer*, 3 vols. (Stuttgart, 1936), presents the English story against the background of the other Europeans in a manner suggesting critical comparisons. See, for example, *ibid.*, III, 194 ff.

sons, have not usually employed the procedure here involved. The study of such special cultural groups as the German-Americans has usually been motivated by an interest in these people for their own sake, with the ultimate purpose of explaining their "contributions" to American life. This is plainly legitimate and important; but it has not ordinarily involved such use of their history as is suggested above. This latter procedure calls for a critical contrast of different groups, not to prove one or the other superior but simply to discover whether there were divergences between them which cannot be ascribed to the common environment. It is obvious that the contrast between British and German settlers is not the only one which could be employed. It is possible, for example, that a significant comparison could be found in early Virginia between two groups of the English-speaking majority themselves; namely, between the Quakers who settled special areas and the larger number who possessed an Anglican background.

There remains, finally, one other question which was latent in the discussion of cultural factors. Reference was there made to "the sort of people" who colonized the South. It was tacitly assumed that this phrase had only cultural implications and did not relate to their physical make-up. No recourse to biological theories seemed necessary, in view of the fact that certain cultural limitations of the English settlers—their lack of farming experience, their profit motive, and so on—seemed adequate to explain their later difficulties. But since able authorities have never entirely abandoned the biological perspective, it would be wise to consider at least the possibility of checking this as well as the other major influences.²²

It would be most interesting if we could discover any actual historical situation in which geographical and cultural elements were constants, and only racial or class phenomena were variables. This might afford us a sort of laboratory test for the physical factor, just as the study

²² American historians and sociologists have long been skeptical about biological factors, but not so American biologists. See, for example, Edwin G. Conklin, "Some Biological Aspects of Immigration," in *Scribner's Magazine* (New York, 1887-), LXIX (1921), 352 ff. "There was once," observes Dr. Conklin, "the supreme chance of breeding here the finest race and nation in the whole history of mankind. . . . That chance is gone forever." *Ibid.*, 358.

summarized above was intended as a check on cultural determinants. Imagine a situation in which the same geographical area (tidewater Virginia) was settled by people possessing the same culture (English) and social opportunities, but sharply divided among themselves along racial lines. Unfortunately, one does have to "imagine" this, for the past has been niggardly in supplying actual settings of this nature. The Virginia Negro of 1800 lived in the same region as the whites, but his culture was an imperfect copy of theirs—perhaps because social opportunity was so largely lacking.

A closer approach to laboratory conditions might be found in the recent record, let us say, of the civilized tribes in Oklahoma, who live in the same or similar areas as the whites, possess more or less of the same culture, and have some degree of social opportunity. Perhaps even better conditions for such an investigation could be found in Mexico or Brazil, but these are beyond our present province. One suspects that such tests would prove negative, but we are hardly in a position to be dogmatic about this. The point is that a historical check on the biological factor, while very difficult, is not necessarily impossible.

Since opportunities of this sort do exist, one may summarize by saying that a renewed study of cultural and possibly of biological origins in the South is indicated for two reasons; first, because it affords a possible opportunity to vary our general procedures; second, for the reason that it may also modify our interpretations and conclusions. We have quite properly heard much of the influence of sections upon American history. We may now also consider, as a phase of that whole process, the influence of sections upon American historians.

The American Society of Equity in Kentucky: A Recent Attempt in Agrarian Reform¹

By THEODORE SALOUTOS

One of the most dramatic episodes in recent agrarian history has had the tobacco fields of Kentucky and western Tennessee for its stage. Commencing early in the twentieth century, a number of sporadic attempts made by the farmers of this area to organize and resist the encroachments of monopoly culminated in what was then popularly referred to as the "Great Tobacco Strike," the "Tobacco Wars," and "Night Riding." Of great significance were the social, economic, and psychological factors attending this melodramatic outburst of agrarian wrath.

In the latter half of the nineteenth century, the tobacco industry was stimulated by two important events: first, the discovery of the white Burley leaf, and second, the rise of the capitalist system. White Burley, introduced in 1864, met with instant public favor; and capitalism, with its industrial and financial accompaniments, readily adapted itself to the tobacco market.² Under favorable conditions tobacco consumption enjoyed tremendous increases, to the profit of both producer and manufacturer.

As tobacco rose in popularity, the corporation rapidly assumed control of the market. The American Tobacco Company, formed in 1890

¹ See J. A. Everitt, *The Third Power* (Indianapolis, 1903), for an account of the purposes of the American Society of Equity. Its ultimate objective was to obtain profitable prices for all products of the farm. It was organized in Indianapolis on December 24, 1902.

² E. H. Mathewson, "The Export and Manufacturing Tobaccos of the United States, with Brief Reference to Cigar Types," in United States Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Plant Industry, *Bulletin No. 244* (Washington, 1912), 71.

with an initial investment of \$25,000,000, underwent a period of rapid expansion and consolidation till in 1906 it was capitalized in excess of \$235,000,000. In 1906 the Commissioner of Corporations announced that eighty-six corporations throughout the United States, its dependencies, Cuba, and the foreign countries in which the British-American operated, came under the influence of the combination. In short, the combination was master of the tobacco markets of the world.³

Not only did the American Tobacco Company control the markets; it soon subjected the tobacco farmer to precarious conditions. The cultivation of tobacco is generally concentrated within a relatively small area, within which soil and climate create districts that specialize in one type of tobacco. Central Kentucky devoted itself primarily to the cultivation of white Burley; west of it was the Green River country specializing in a heavy dark export brand; west and south of the Green River district lay the Henderson Stemming region, likewise specializing in a dark export type; and to the west of the Henderson area was the "black-patch" or "dark-fired" country, embracing counties in both Kentucky and Tennessee.⁴ It is estimated that at the start of the twentieth century, some 85 of the 119 counties of Kentucky were dependent on tobacco.⁵

For some twenty or thirty years prior to the tobacco difficulties, an army of "ignorant, illiterate, tenant-farmers" had poured into the tobacco areas to raise tobacco on share leases.⁶ The tenant would usually be assigned thirty or forty acres and a house, barn, and sheds. The houses were merely shacks that constantly needed repairs. Upon receiving his land allotment, the tenant proceeded to raise tobacco on about ten acres; and devoted the remainder to corn, vegetables, pasture,

³ *Report of the Commissioner of Corporations on the Tobacco Industry*, 3 pts. (Washington, 1909-1915), I, *Position of the Tobacco Combination in the Industry* (1909), 14-15. The British-American conducted the combination's foreign business.

⁴ John L. Mathews, "Agrarian Pooling in Kentucky," in *Charities and the Commons* (New York, 1897-), XX (1908), 193; J. C. Miller, *The Black Patch War* (Chapel Hill, 1936), 1.

⁵ *Wisconsin Equity News* (Madison, 1908-1933), I (1908-1909), No. 3, p. 1; E. A. Jonas, "The Night-Riders: A Trust of Farmers," in *World's Work* (New York, 1900-), XVII (1909), 11214.

⁶ Mathews, "Agrarian Pooling in Kentucky," in *loc. cit.*, 193.

or possibly wheat. The landlord, likewise, advanced the necessary money to cultivate the crop and maintain the tenant's family. At the end of the year, the tenant shared the crop with the landlord; the former selling the remaining half and paying the latter his obligations, and then supposedly pocketing the profits that seldom accrued. To improve his economic status, the tenant sought to increase his acreage and frequently added a new member to the family in hopes of receiving an additional wageless worker. Investigations, nevertheless, reveal that a lifetime of such conditions frequently left the tenant farmer worse off than when he began.⁷

While the producer sought to accelerate his productive powers along what appeared to be a rising market, the combination had already commenced its program for purchase control. The manufacturing and marketing processes of the industry were already under control; next, tobacco prices paid the producer were to come under the trust's dictatorial rule. Middlemen and independent buyers who previously purchased their tobacco directly from the producer and resold it to the combination, were eliminated or cut to a minimum. Usually one and occasionally two agents, who in no sense competed with each other, traveled the tobacco country to purchase for the company.⁸ Thus commenced a policy of reorganization that took its toll in hardship and violence, to the detriment of the producer, the manufacturer, and the tobacco country in general.

The planter being a close marginal producer soon felt the bitter effects of the combination's new policy. The first signs of depression were low tobacco prices in a period of generally high living costs. In the early 1900's wholesale prices of Hopkinsville leaf, a dark type, sold as low as four and six cents; as did Clarksville leaf, another dark variety.⁹ In the Burley districts "poverty and distress" prevailed and

⁷ *Ibid.*; Miller, *Black Patch War*, 2.

⁸ *Senate Documents*, 59 Cong., 2 Sess., VI, No. 372, p. 42; Anna Youngman, "The Tobacco Pools of Kentucky and Tennessee," in *Journal of Political Economy* (Chicago, 1892-), XVIII (1910), 36; Miller, *Black Patch War*, 14-15; T. D. Clark, *History of Kentucky* (New York, 1937), 554-55; C. M. Meachem, *A History of Christian County, Kentucky* (Nashville, 1930), 343.

⁹ *Yearbook of the Department of Agriculture*, 1913 (Washington, 1914), 431.

conditions became so deplorable that "many producers were compelled to sell tobacco at prices which returned them thirty cents a day."¹⁰

Not only did tobacco prices decline but tobacco raising itself was threatened for the want of certain conditions favorable to its well-being. Many capable planters cultivating tobacco at a cost of six cents per pound and forced to sell at the ruinous level of three and four, left the tobacco country and migrated to more profitable farming regions. Labor costs were high. A good farm hand demanded \$1.50 in the dark-patch regions and \$2.00 to \$3.00 per day in the Burley areas, but low tobacco prices made the payment of a decent wage impossible.¹¹ As a result, the more able farm hands left the tobacco fields to seek employment in mining, railroading, or in urban communities.¹²

Despite the deeply implanted isolationist attitude of the farmers, the possibilities of combined action were beginning to be sensed by many. As early as 1901 agitation to restrict acreage and the possible benefits of tobacco pooling became frequent topics of discussion.¹³ Numerous local associations were formed but their existence was short-lived.¹⁴ An attempt to pool the 1904 crop was made but failed because of the want of adequate financial resources to tide the farmers through the waiting period.¹⁵ In 1905 a pool, which was started among the Burley producers

¹⁰ H. C. Filley, *Cooperation in Agriculture* (New York, 1929), 246-47.

¹¹ *Wisconsin Equity News*, I (1908-1909), No. 3, p. 2; Filley, *Cooperation in Agriculture*, 246.

¹² *Wisconsin Equity News*, I (1908-1909), No. 3, p. 2.

¹³ E. H. Mathewson, "Tobacco Marketing in the United States," in United States Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Plant Industry, *Bulletin No. 268* (Washington, 1913), 47.

¹⁴ *Wisconsin Equity News*, I (1908-1909), No. 3, p. 4; Mathewson, "The Export and Manufacturing Tobaccos of the United States," in *loc. cit.*, 79; Jonas, "The Night-Riders: A Trust of Farmers," in *loc. cit.*, 11214. While the producer was speedily heading in the direction of financial adversity, the combination was experiencing the most profitable years of its existence. The prices of its principal brands to the consumer remained relatively constant, whereas the prices extracted from its jobbers were increased to add to its enormous profits. The combination's most fruitful years, 1903-1908, were the most trying for the producer. Thus, while the trust enjoyed lower tax rates, moderate leaf costs, decreased advertising expenditures, and perfect monopolistic control, the producer scarcely earned a decent livelihood. *Report of the Commissioner of Corporations on the Tobacco Industry, III, Prices, Costs, and Profits* (1915), 7-8.

¹⁵ Mathewson, "The Export and Manufacturing Tobaccos of the United States," in *loc. cit.*, 79.

of central Kentucky, encountered little success.¹⁶ The American Society of Equity, in the meantime, had commenced to penetrate the tobacco areas of Kentucky and Tennessee and once again some of the most influential planters talked of the possibilities of co-operative action.¹⁷ With the price drop of 1904, renewed emphasis was given to co-operative sentiment and crop restriction and tobacco-pooling propaganda increased in momentum.¹⁸

The American Society of Equity, the first agricultural organization to make its appearance in the twentieth century in the upper Mississippi Valley, was founded in Indianapolis on December 24, 1902. Operating on the theory that agricultural producers were not receiving an equitable price for their products, the Equity founders conceived the idea of organizing the farmers to place a price on all products of the "farm and orchard." The leaders predicted that the farmers if properly organized could wield a power comparable to that of organized capital and labor.

In the face of these ruinous conditions, Felix G. Ewing, a wealthy planter of Glenraven, Tennessee, called some sixty or seventy of the more influential planters to his home for a conference early in the spring of 1904.¹⁹ Ewing, being a man of influence and leisure, presented an elaborate analysis of the planters' difficulties, and convinced them their only hope was organization. The farmers accepted the suggestion and immediately became "apostles of the new idea."²⁰ On September 24, 1904, a meeting was called to convene at Guthrie, Todd County, on the Kentucky-Tennessee line, where some six thousand farmers assem-

¹⁶ J. S. Porter, "Kentucky Tobacco Pools," in *Kentucky Progress Magazine* (Frankfort, 1928-), IV (1932), No. 5, p. 25.

¹⁷ *Up-to-Date Farming* (Indianapolis, 1898-1917), VI (1903), No. 19, pp. 17-18. Membership in Equity at the time virtually consisted of a year's subscription to the official organ of the Society. In 1903 Equity boasted a membership of 2,156 in Kentucky and 1,808 in Tennessee.

¹⁸ Mathewson, "Tobacco Marketing in the United States," in *loc. cit.*, 47.

¹⁹ Youngman, "The Tobacco Pools of Kentucky and Tennessee," in *loc. cit.*, 47; Marie Taylor, "Night Riders in the Black Patch" (Master's Thesis, University of Kentucky Library, Lexington, 1934), 11-18. The Planters' Protective Association, which functioned from 1904 to 1913, operated in eighteen counties of Kentucky and ten in Tennessee, mainly along the Kentucky border.

²⁰ *Wisconsin Equity News*, I (1908-1909), No. 3, p. 6.

bled. Congressman John W. Gaines of Tennessee and Augustus O. Stanley of Kentucky addressed the gathering. Before the day ended the Planters' Protective Association had been organized.²¹

While the dark tobacco growers were busy organizing their respective groups, the Burley planters, this time largely under the direct supervision of Equity, commenced a campaign of organization.²² The American Society of Equity hoped to obtain equitable prices by controlling the production and distribution of crops. In theory the Equity program consisted of two parts: first, organizing the farmers to place a price on their product; and second, eliminating a portion of the crop if necessary to influence prices.²³

Among the early converts to the needs of co-operative action was a youthful Henry County farmer, H. E. McSwain, who, persuaded by the merits of the "Equity idea," traversed the Burley areas with a mortgage in one hand and arguments in the other to stir the planters into action. The results were that eight local Equity unions were established and the prospects for more were encouraging.²⁴ Delegates from these eight locals met at Newcastle on October 1, 1906. The gathering, however, accomplished nothing because of the presence of trust emissaries and the pleas of the numerous delegates to adjourn and call another meeting. The assembly adjourned to reconvene at Winchester on October 10. The planters, more sensitive to existing conditions and problems, succeeded in carrying their fight to the floor of the State Development Association, an organization of business men, where they gained sympathy and recruits for their cause. Inspired by this and other encourag-

²¹ O. B. Jesness, "The Cooperative Marketing of Tobacco," in Kentucky Agricultural Station, *Bulletin No. 288* (Lexington, 1928), 276; Filley, *Cooperation in Agriculture*, 247. Professor Jesness takes the view that Equity and the Protective Association were not very intimately associated. Filley, on the other hand, states that Equity was largely responsible for the organization of the Planters' Protective Association. However, it appears that Equity, with the membership it had, must have exerted some influence.

²² Jesness, "The Cooperative Marketing of Tobacco," in *loc. cit.*, 276.

²³ J. L. Nash, "Building a Farmers' Monopoly," in *World Today* (New York, 1901-), XIII (1907), 720. As one Equity enthusiast stated: "It is not the big crops that made money for the farmers. The largest crops we have raised have brought the smallest returns, while our short crops have been money makers."

²⁴ *Wisconsin Equity News*, I (1908-1909), No. 3, p. 4.

ing developments, the planters decided to embark on a still greater campaign of education.²⁵

Equity, in the meantime, increased its activities by sending more organizers and sheaves of co-operative literature to the scene of operations. Dr. George W. McMillan of Pendleton County was named manager of a "forty-day whirlwind campaign" to pledge farmers not to dispose of their 1905 crop at the prices offered by the trust. "Two-score speaking and proselyting parties were at once organized, eloquent speakers were found, brass bands were hired, calls and notices were printed, and they started out to meet on January 2, 1907."²⁶

On January 2, 58 per cent of the estimated 92,000 acres planted for the year were reported pledged to the new organization.²⁷ Under the leadership of J. Campbell Cantrill, president of the Kentucky Union of Equity and later congressman from his district,²⁸ the Burley Tobacco Society was organized with Clarence LeBus, a wealthy Cynthiana planter, as president, and Lucian Beckner, a young Winchester lawyer, as secretary.²⁹

While organizers campaigned the tobacco country for membership and their representatives sought to mediate their difficulties, the Society of Equity took to political action. Kentucky's constitution made it mandatory upon the legislature to enact legislation declaring illegal the combining or pooling of articles for the purpose of enhancing prices. The legislature, influenced by the size of its agricultural population and the seriousness of the crisis, enacted a measure declaring that persons

²⁵ *Ibid.*

²⁶ *Ibid.*

²⁷ Everitt, *The Third Power* (4th ed.), 289. In the ceremonies that followed the meeting, Everitt, national president of the American Society of Equity, was heralded "as the Moses who had pointed out the way," and Sherman, national organizer, "as the Aaron who had held up his hand and led on to the promised land."

²⁸ *Who's Who in America, 1910-1911* (Chicago, 1910), 306; J. Campbell Cantrill had a varied political career before assuming the presidency of the Kentucky union. He was chairman of the Scott County, Kentucky, Democratic Committee, 1895-1897; a member of the state Senate, 1901-1904; was nominated, but declined the nomination, for Congress in 1904; was a delegate to the Democratic National Convention in 1904; and in 1908 was elected to Congress.

²⁹ *Wisconsin Equity News*, I (1908-1909), No. 2, p. 6. Clarence LeBus, president of the Burley Society, was a dealer and grower of tobacco.

engaged in agriculture might combine or pool for the purpose of securing better prices. The law further provided that it was an offense for any third person to persuade a member to withdraw from the pool or to dispose of his tobacco otherwise than through the channels prescribed by the organization.³⁰

The enthusiasm of the members increased tremendously and prospects appeared very promising. Members agreed to deliver their unsold 1906 and their entire 1907 crop to be warehoused until the price rose to fifteen cents. Sixty-five thousand acres were pledged to the 1906 pool and in 1907, 108,000 of the 160,000 planted were promised. The Burley farmers became so determined, rumors were soon circulated in the tobacco country that unless their demands were met, the entire 1908 crop would be eliminated.³¹

Despite the methods employed to facilitate organization, difficulties of the most trying character arose. The unfavorable land tenure system, the slow, lethargic, and indifferent farmer, financial inability, and trust opposition delayed action. The land tenure system was obviously very discouraging.³² As one third to one half of the farms were operated by financially pressed tenants, the farmers were anxious to negotiate immediate sales. Financial assistance was indispensable. Fortunately, however, both the Planters' Protective Association and the Burley Society received considerable assistance from their wealthier members. Sympathetic warehousemen in Louisville and Cincinnati who saw their business menaced rendered an assisting hand.³³

³⁰ E. G. Nourse, *The Legal Status of Agricultural Cooperation* (New York, 1927), 541-43. The act of 1906 contained the following emergency provision: "Whereas, many persons of the Commonwealth now desire to combine their respective crops of tobacco, wheat, corn and other farm products an emergency is now declared."

A novel piece of legislation, if passed, would have forbidden a combination or trust from transacting business in the state, and would have required of every purchaser a certification that he was not purchasing for any "trust" or "combination." *Wisconsin Equity News*, I (1908-1909), No. 3, pp. 5-6.

³¹ *Wisconsin Equity News*, I (1908-1909), No. 3, p. 5.

³² Youngman, "The Tobacco Pools of Kentucky and Tennessee," in *loc. cit.*, 40-41; John L. Mathews, "The Farmer's Union and the Tobacco Pool," in *Atlantic Monthly* (Boston, 1857-), CII (1908), 484.

³³ *Wisconsin Equity News*, I (1908-1909), No. 3, p. 5; R. Bache, "The Great Tobacco Strike," in *Technical World Magazine* (Chicago, 1904-1923), VI (1907), 604; Youngman, "The Tobacco Pools of Kentucky and Tennessee," in *loc. cit.*, 43. The farmer upon

Another obstacle was the stern opposition of the combination. As expected, the trust stopped at nothing to break the pooling movement. The press was utilized in every conceivable form. Words of "friendly warning" were made to the neighboring banks and many, frightened at the trust's power, insisted on payment when the farmers' paper matured.³⁴ On one occasion, a "fake" co-operative, launched by the trust, succeeded in attracting a number of farmers who learned too late that it was a company device to smash the farmers' program.³⁵

One of the most powerful weapons employed by the combination was the old Standard Oil method of overbidding the competitor. Trust agents traveled from farm to farm seeking to convince the farmers of the benefits of selling direct to the company. One such purchaser remarked: "What is the use of going into the association? We will give you as good and better prices than they can get for you and there will be no commissions or expenses. Sell to us direct, here is the cash for you now!" Many of the planters, attracted by the lucrative offer, succumbed and sold out, with little thought as to the effect their action would have.³⁶

One of the most discouraging obstacles was the independent farmer who asserted his independence by refusing to join the association. Some were convinced the organization could not possibly increase the value of their crop. Others believed a better price could be obtained by refusing to join the association, and many actually succeeded in getting it; consequently, the talk of co-operative action to these people was futile. Many refused membership because of the failure of previous attempts, while still others suspected organizers of utilizing a perfectly good ideal to enhance their personal ambitions.

Association members viewed the independent farmer with alarm, for while the member pledged not to sell, the nonmember or "hillbilly" cashed in at a remunerative figure. This not only provoked the pool delivering his tobacco to the warehouse would receive a certificate that could be discounted at the bank.

³⁴ *Wisconsin Equity News*, I (1908-1909), No. 3, p. 6.

³⁵ *Organized Farmer* (Wausau, Milwaukee, 1915-1922), III (1917), No. 13, p. 4. This "fake" co-operative charged \$1.00 for membership while Equity charged \$4.00.

³⁶ *Wisconsin Equity News*, I (1908-1909), No. 3, p. 6.

members but, in turn, caused many to withhold further membership. The disgusted member could see no possible advantage in joining the organization and suffering, while the independent farmer remained outside the fold and enjoyed all the possible benefits an organization could bring—a higher price.

At the outset association membership was voluntary, but it soon became apparent that a more aggressive policy would have to be employed. The use of violence was not without precedent in Kentucky. Its prototype appeared in the Reconstruction period following the Civil War. A few years prior to the tobacco difficulties the "toll-gate" system in Kentucky appeared oppressive and much agitation to eliminate the practice was waged. Convinced of the improbabilities of legislative relief, a group of Kentuckians undertook a campaign of night riding that eventually culminated in the system's complete elimination.⁸⁷

Aware of the accomplishments of these early uprisings and convinced of the futility of the tobacco farmers' peaceful attempts at co-operation, the suggestion of violent action commenced to take hold in the minds of some of the more prominent pool leaders. "There existed, therefore, a deep-seated sense of grievance and injury," commented the *World's Work*. "The farmers led to regard themselves as the victims of organized and legalized plunder grew reckless in speech and bitter in spirit. Protests were futile, the courts no longer offered hope of redress. Organized opposition was the last resource."⁸⁸ Consequently, more radical measures were in the process of formation. "His neighbors proceeded to organize secret bands, first to threaten him, next to destroy his property, finally to whip him, and if need were, to kill him."⁸⁹ Night riding became a stark reality.

A variety of methods were employed by the masked riders to enforce their demands. The whip was inflicted on the nonconforming farmer or on those who "talked too much"; tobacco purchasers as well as farmers were brutally assaulted; arson and shootings were by no means

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*; Mathews, "The Farmer's Union and the Tobacco Pool," in *loc. cit.*, 489-90; Thomas C. Cherry, *Kentucky* (Boston, 1923), 312.

⁸⁸ Jonas, "The Night-Riders: A Trust of Farmers," in *loc. cit.*, 11214.

⁸⁹ Youngman, "The Tobacco Pools of Kentucky and Tennessee," in *loc. cit.*, 45.

uncommon; plant beds were sown with salt or grass seed; and threshing machines were dynamited. One terror-stricken farmer found that during the night a grave had been dug in the midst of one of his plant beds. A tobacco factory was destroyed at Trenton. In December, 1906, an armed force of masked riders invaded Princeton and destroyed a number of barns containing approximately two hundred thousand pounds of tobacco. In January, 1907, the Cadiz railroad was warned not to haul tobacco to Hopkinsville.⁴⁰ In March, a band of night riders rolled twenty-one hogsheds of tobacco into the Cumberland River.⁴¹ In December, Hopkinsville was besieged by a band of riders coming from four directions, who seized all means of communication, the police and fire departments, the administrative quarters of the city government, and destroyed one large warehouse and a tobacco factory.⁴²

These developments were, of course, to have their repercussions on the social, political, and economic life of the tobacco country. Selling tobacco independent of the farmers' associations was dangerous; neighbors became suspicious of one another; and terror prevailed everywhere. The courts of law were paralyzed because of perjury, packed juries, or fear on the part of witnesses to testify against the known "marauders."⁴³ Hundreds of farmers left the tobacco areas in search of homes elsewhere. In 1907 the Secretary of the Kentucky Board of Fire Underwriters cautioned that "unless confidence can be restored, the companies will refuse indemnity to all handlers of tobacco."⁴⁴

Changes, however, were soon to come. In 1907 the traditionally Democratic state of Kentucky elected a Republican administration headed by Governor Augustus E. Willson, who was accused of being unduly sympathetic with the tobacco trust.⁴⁵ One of his first acts was to appeal to the state "to take strong, prompt and effective measures to

⁴⁰ Meachem, *History of Christian County, Kentucky*, 346-48; Miller, *Black Patch War*, 16-17.

⁴¹ In such instances as these the night riders were apt to cite the activities of the Boston Tea Party as a "justifying precedent." See Miller, *Black Patch War*, 18.

⁴² Jonas, "The Night-Riders: A Trust of Farmers," in *loc. cit.*, 11215.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 11217.

⁴⁴ Taylor, "Night Riders in the Black Patch," 38.

⁴⁵ Lexington *Herald*, November 2, 1908.

punish every cowardly scoundrel who rides the road to threaten his neighbors."⁴⁶ State troops were rushed to the scenes of lawlessness where, after being "ambushed" or "misdirected" and subjected to local prejudices that resented interference by the state government, they began slowly to enforce the law.⁴⁷

In the course of these violent outbursts, public sentiment, which previously stood firmly behind the farmers, assumed a decidedly hostile attitude. The press denounced Equity members as rioters and outlaws and condemned others for their association affiliations. The Louisville *Courier-Journal* declared the farmers had a just cause in fighting the trust but protested that outlawry was no solution to the difficulties. "Masquerading is cowardice. Cowardice is cruelty. Through these agencies not only is Kentucky brought to blush, but farmers are put in for consequences which in the long run prove ruinous."⁴⁸ In defending the Society, the Benton, Kentucky, *Tribune-Democrat* stated: "Possibly some of the night-riders are members of the American Society of Equity and the Dark Tobacco Association, just as different churches have bad people [who] become members of the church, but that does not make the churches bad; neither does the night-rider make the association bad."⁴⁹ Equity leaders disclaimed responsibility for violence and openly denounced the practice; nevertheless, it was apparent that some of the Equity members were active in the affairs of the masked order.

With night riding falling into disrepute and negotiations failing to materialize in a satisfactory agreement, pool leaders became more desperate and discussed the possibilities of making another determined effort to control production. Having the 1906 crop unsold, the 1907 crop coming in, and the trust refusing to accept the tobacco pool's demands, Equity and Burley leaders proposed to eliminate the entire crop for 1908. Soon thereafter the Peaceful Riders by Day, an organization commanded by some of the most influential planters of the tobacco country,

⁴⁶ Cherry, *Kentucky*, 312; Meachem, *History of Christian County, Kentucky*, 357; Jonas, "The Night-Riders: A Trust of Farmers," in *loc. cit.*, 11217.

⁴⁷ Jonas, "The Night-Riders: A Trust of Farmers," in *loc. cit.*, 11217.

⁴⁸ Louisville *Courier-Journal*, quoted in *Wisconsin Equity News*, I (1908-1909), No. 2, p. 5.

⁴⁹ Benton (Kentucky) *Tribune-Democrat*, quoted in *Wisconsin Equity News*, I (1908-1909), No. 2, p. 5.

solicited the community and obtained the support of farmers willing to eliminate the 1908 crop.⁵⁰ Many signed, fearing a reoccurrence of night riding, while others considered the proposal as feasible, believing that the pool might dispose of its surplus crop.⁵¹

The atmosphere in the tobacco areas was gloomy. Planters were divided, some maintaining a 1908 crop would be financially inexpedient, while others accepted the theory of crop elimination. The early months of 1908 were intense with excitement, rivaling conditions prior to the outbreak of the Civil War. Business was at a standstill.⁵² Not only did the pool leaders experience difficulty in soliciting farmers' support, but similar, trying hardships were encountered in keeping up the morale of the members.⁵³

Despite the innumerable obstacles that threatened to make the elimination of the 1908 crop an impossibility, there were indications that a very large percentage of the crop was to be eliminated. The estimated acreage in the Burley country fell to 18 per cent of normal and similar, sharp reductions in the dark-tobacco country were effected, causing the business receipts of the Louisville and Cincinnati markets to drop to the low figures of the previous year.⁵⁴ Western market receipts, which in

⁵⁰ Filley, *Cooperation in Agriculture*, 250; Mathews, "The Farmer's Union and the Tobacco Pool," in *loc. cit.*, 488; *Wisconsin Equity News*, I (1908-1909), No. 15, p. 2. Equity claimed a membership of eight thousand in 1908.

⁵¹ Mathews, "The Farmer's Union and the Tobacco Pool," in *loc. cit.*, 488. Among the most enthusiastic espousers of the crop elimination ideology was Cantrill, who appealed to a gathering of New Castle, Henry County, farmers in the following words: "You who are in the pool, I tell you to sit idle this year. You will get rich doing nothing. You have two crops of Burley in the pool. If you sell them for 15 cents each, there will be 25 cents coming back to you, and if you are idle there will be three years to divide it over. That will be 8 cents a pound a year. But if you grow tobacco this year the pool will be thrown on the market, and you will get only 4, or maybe 6, cents a pound for each year. Three years at 6 cents is 18 cents. Two years at 15, less cost of the pool, is 25. You will have more profit if you sit idle than if you work. But you who are not in the pool, let me say to you that if you grow tobacco enough to threaten our market, when your crop is almost ready we will dump 175,000,000 pounds of pooled tobacco on the market for what we can get. The market will drop to 2 cents or less, and you will not get enough for yours to pay to haul it to market. Now take your choice. Stand idle and help us—or we will ruin you."

⁵² *Ibid.*; *Wisconsin Equity News*, I (1908-1909), No. 15, p. 1.

⁵³ *Organized Farmer*, II (1916), No. 2, p. 4.

⁵⁴ Mathewson, "Tobacco Marketing in the United States," in *loc. cit.*, 47-48; Filley, *Cooperation in Agriculture*, 250-51; Taylor, "Night Riders in the Black Patch," 23. To

1889 were placed at three hundred thousand hogsheads, dwindled to approximately one hundred and ten thousand in 1909.⁵⁵

Meanwhile, negotiations continued, but as usual all attempts at conciliation ended in failure. The independent purchasers continued their pool purchases at an average of \$17 per hundred pounds. The trust, however, repeatedly refused to accept the planters' demands—which insisted that tobacco from a later year would not be sold unless the supply of the previous year was first exhausted. On one occasion the trust virtually offered to purchase the entire 1907 crop but the planters again refused, once more demanding that the earlier supply be purchased first and that some tobacco be reserved for the independent dealers who remained faithful to the farmers in the course of the crisis.⁵⁶

On November 19 another attempt was made to mediate the differences between the two groups. After engaging in another prolonged discussion, an agreement was finally reached. Immediately the passage of some sixty million pounds of Burley tobacco, totalling approximately \$12,000,000, was affected, thus ending hours of endless waiting on the part of the farmers.⁵⁷ Shortly thereafter, the dark tobacco pool was sold to put to end one of the most dramatic victories staged by the farmer in recent years.⁵⁸

This unparalleled victory, however, was to be of temporary duration. The natural consequence accompanying the rise in tobacco prices should have been an organization of farmers on a permanent basis. The farmer to the contrary displayed a complete indifference to organization that immediately stifled all further possibilities. In Bourbon County, Kentucky, a large number of prominent farmers, who were in the fore-

regulate production, Equity established the following standards: ten thousand hills of tobacco were allowed for every man or boy over sixteen years of age; boys ranging from twelve to sixteen years were permitted five thousand hills; and women and children under twelve were not allowed any.

⁵⁵ Mathewson, "Tobacco Marketing in the United States," in *loc. cit.*, 47-48; Filley, *Cooperation in Agriculture*, 250-51.

⁵⁶ *Wisconsin Equity News*, I (1908-1909), No. 16, p. 2.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.* The preliminary draft of the agreement, signed by R. K. Smith and Clarence LeBus, read as follows: "The American Tobacco Company has bought seventy-five percent of the 1906 pooled tobacco at scheduled prices and seventy-five percent of the 1907 pooled tobacco at graded prices to average seventeen cents."

⁵⁸ Filley, *Cooperation in Agriculture*, 251.

ground when the pooling of the 1907 crop took place, were conspicuously lacking in enthusiasm in 1909.⁵⁹ In the course of the pooling period, a number of distasteful experiences led to the disintegration of the Burley Society. First, there was a feeling of doubt on the part of many that prices could not be regulated unless production were controlled, with many maintaining control was impossible unless accompanied with violence which scarcely compensated the farmer for the hours of agony he underwent. Others insisted that restricted production in one area was not an assurance of price increases, for the deficit in one area might well be offset by increased productivity in another.⁶⁰ As one authority remarked, tobacco was marketed at a good price, but it was "achieved at too great a cost to make a repetition desirable."⁶¹ Second, there was a feeling of distrust and suspicion on the part of the membership of both the Burley Society and the Planters' Protective Association.⁶² A considerable number of the financially pressed farmers were of necessity forced to sell their warehouse receipts at sharply reduced figures, which in many instances the wealthier members of the organizations were only too glad to seize upon. This speculative enterprise proved profitable to a few; but the small and hard-pressed farmer could scarcely approve of seeing his many months of tiresome waiting go to naught. In Lyon County a group of five hundred farmers protested in a resolution that unless certain conditions were righted, they "as white, free-born citizens" would never pledge another pound of tobacco to the Planters' Protective Association.⁶³ Third, friction and hostility arising out of the personal and administrative differences among the officers became a disintegrating factor,⁶⁴ as was dissatisfaction over the grading

⁵⁹ Lexington *Herald*, September 20, 1909.

⁶⁰ B. H. Hibbard, *Marketing of Agricultural Products* (New York, 1921), 235.

⁶¹ Filley, *Cooperation in Agriculture*, 251.

⁶² Youngman, "The Tobacco Pools of Kentucky and Tennessee," in *loc. cit.*, 41-44; Lexington *Herald*, September 28, November 2, 1908.

⁶³ *Wisconsin Equity News*, I (1908-1909), No. 15, p. 2.

⁶⁴ Youngman, "The Tobacco Pools of Kentucky and Tennessee," in *loc. cit.*, 41-44; Lexington *Herald*, January 18, August 9, 16, 1909. The inability of Equity and its affiliated or subsidiary organizations to carry on harmoniously characterized the history of the Society from beginning to end. Such was the case not only in Kentucky, but virtually in every state in which the organization carried on.

The American Society of Equity was incorporated as an educational organization, con-

and handling of tobacco.⁶⁵ One of the biggest disputes revolved around the salary the president of the Burley society was to receive.⁶⁶ Fourth, some of the farmers actually were of the opinion their bargaining difficulties ended with the settlement of the Burley dispute, and consequently could see no further need for organization. This element believed tobacco prices were up to stay.⁶⁷ Fifth, adverse court decisions, likewise, had a demoralizing influence. In 1909 an independent tobacco manufacturer filed suit in Federal court against officers of the Burley Society, charging the organization with conspiracy to control the white Burley market.⁶⁸ In the spring of 1910 a group of Equity farmers were convicted and fined for violating the Sherman Anti-Trust Act, by asking planters to withhold tobacco sales until a better price was obtainable. The decision in the Danbury Hatter's Case was also accepted as an ill omen, which also hastened the organization's disintegration.⁶⁹

In 1909, following the low crop year of 1908, the Burley output skyrocketed to new heights, it being invariably the practice of farmers to stimulate production immediately following a good price year.⁷⁰ The farmers resumed their old practice of raising as much tobacco as previously, naturally assuming the combination would continue purchasing at the recent high level.⁷¹ Though the crop and acreage production took a decided turn upward, prices did not drop to former low levels;⁷² the reform in marketing methods, the rise of the export market, the dissolution of the American Tobacco Company by the United States Supreme Court, and generally rising price conditions—all served as contributing factors.

sequently, it could not engage in any marketing operations. Thus, to expedite the marketing program the farmers were obliged to form a marketing organization. Such was the case of the Burley Society in Kentucky.

⁶⁵ *Lexington Herald*, September 21, 1908.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, May 31, 1909.

⁶⁷ Hibbard, *Marketing of Agricultural Products*, 236.

⁶⁸ *The New International Yearbook*, 1909 (New York, 1910), 405.

⁶⁹ *Wisconsin Equity News*, III (1910-1911), No. 3, p. 10; Hibbard, *Marketing of Agricultural Products*, 236; *The New International Yearbook*, 1910 (New York, 1911), 401.

⁷⁰ *Lexington Herald*, January 11, 1908; February 22, November 8, 1909.

⁷¹ Hibbard, *Marketing of Agricultural Products*, 235.

⁷² *Lexington Herald*, September 28, 1908.

Despite the farmers' difficulties in combatting the trust, they succeeded in realizing certain benefits that contributed to the betterment of the tobacco market. The farmers displayed an ability to work together under proper conditions and convinced the tobacco industry they were a problem to contend with when properly organized. Funds were collected to establish warehouses and some seventeen were built. A tobacco factory was likewise started.⁷³

The early Equity program did not contemplate the destruction of the trust, but rather sought to counteract its activities by organizing the farmers to meet it on an equal footing.⁷⁴ The American Tobacco Company being virtually the sole purchaser of tobacco had, by far, the advantage in its relations with the multitude of small unorganized producers, who were destitute of marketing information and bargaining power. Once an organization was achieved, the farmers, by controlling the production and the marketing of their products, could demand what they considered an equitable price. This crop restriction and price-fixing ideology still persists, having found its most recent expression in the agricultural reform policies of the New Deal. Despite the merits and demerits of the policy, we must acknowledge that it constitutes one of the programs advanced for the solution of the twentieth century agricultural problems.⁷⁵

⁷³ Hibbard, *Marketing of Agricultural Products*, 238; Filley, *Cooperation in Agriculture*, 251-52; John Hanna, "Agricultural Cooperation in Tobacco," in *Law and Contemporary Problems* (Durham, 1932-), I (1934), 303. Youngman, "The Tobacco Pools of Kentucky and Tennessee," in *loc. cit.*, 42, quotes from a warehouseman's letter as follows: "Before the organization of the farmers, they would sell tobacco from the barn to the speculator without knowing what it would be used for or to whom it was best suited. Consequently, a large percentage of them had no fixed idea except to grow a pound of tobacco, thinking all kinds should be worth the same money per pound. . . . Now the farmer has been educated to know that tobacco has different values, and to learn the methods of growing these different grades."

⁷⁴ Jonas, "The Night-Riders: A Trust of Farmers," in *loc. cit.*, 11214; Bache, "The Great Tobacco Strike," in *loc. cit.*, 605-606.

⁷⁵ Crop elimination and crop restriction appear crude to many of our present-day agricultural reformers. Obtaining monopolistic control of most agricultural products is next to impossible. The temporary success of the Kentucky program was due largely to a number of favorable circumstances, such as the localized character of tobacco production, the tangible nature of the grievances the farmers suffered from, the nonperishable quality of the tobacco crop, the forthcoming of local leadership as well as financial support—and the unfortunate use of violence.

Notes and Documents

ULRICH BONNELL PHILLIPS: HISTORIAN OF THE SOUTH

By FRED LANDON

It is not given to many men to receive from their fellows such recurring tributes of respect as have been tendered to Ulrich Bonnell Phillips in the four years that have passed since his death.¹ Already he has been accorded high place in the ranks of American historical scholarship, and in that field which he made so much his own fresh monuments to his memory arise year by year in the studies of younger men whom he inspired. There will be many appraisals of his work in the days to come because in printed page it lies open to the reader. The man himself, teacher, scholar, friend, will also remain clear-cut in the memory of those who worked under his guidance or were associated with him in historical activities. Such impressions and memories as are here recorded are set down less for those who knew him than in the hope that some glimpses of his personality may give greater interest and meaning to his writings. It would be a happy circumstance if not one but many of those who knew Phillips would set down each his own remembrances of the man. The details of the picture might vary but from all would come the recollection of a man who, in addition to being a great scholar, was also great in character, in friendship, and in understanding of his fellows. The writer acknowledges the honor of being asked by the program committee of the Southern Historical Association to prepare this paper, and for what may seem to be of personal nature in the narrative asks the reader's indulgence.

It may be of interest first of all to point out that among the English

¹ This paper was read at the annual meeting of the Southern Historical Association in New Orleans, November 5, 1938.

speaking people of Canada there has long been a marked interest in the history of the South. For this interest various explanations might be offered. A common British ancestry is scarcely enough to account for it. The continuous arrival of runaway slaves in Upper Canada after 1815 may be mentioned as one source of interest. Though Canadian sympathies, like those of the people of England, were of mixed character during the Civil War, there was a minor link with the South in the presence in Upper Canada (Ontario) of many Southern families sent far North while the men were on active service. Even to this day family names may be found in Ontario which have a distinct flavor of old Charleston and of other portions of the South. The importance of the Civil War itself as a factor in the evolution of the Dominion of Canada is a well-recognized fact in Canadian history. It is not too much to say that the Dominion of Canada was a by-product of the Civil War.

It was through correspondence over some phases of these Canadian-American relations that the writer was first brought into touch with Phillips soon after the close of the Great War. His *American Negro Slavery* had already appeared, and he was even then becoming interested in studies of the reaction of slavery upon public opinion outside the bounds of the South, even in Canada. He suggested that the Canadian conceptions of the Southern economy, particularly slavery, ought to be studied in the same way that he hoped to see the Northern point of view investigated in selected areas during certain definite periods. Had his life not been cut short these subjects would doubtless have come increasingly within the range of his own careful inquiry and thought. In later years he gave encouragement to this broadened conception of Southern history, as was shown by his interest in the work of Gilbert H. Barnes on the abolitionist crusade. One may challenge the statement that "He was never able to fit the abolitionist movement into its proper niche in the sectional problem because he lacked an adequate understanding of northern trends in the period."² If he was not able to fit it into its proper niche it was because he had discerned that accepted explanations of the rise of the abolitionist movement were inadequate

² Wood Gray, "Ulrich Bonnell Phillips," in William T. Hutchinson (ed.), *The Marcus W. Jernegan Essays in American Historiography* (Chicago, 1937), 371.

and he himself suggested the inquiry which has given a new and more satisfactory explanation of the movement than any that preceded it.³ He had long felt that the whole record of antislavery and abolitionist activities needed serious revision, a view with which most American historians would still be in agreement. It was the writer's privilege to be present during a reading of the Barnes thesis while it was in manuscript and to have some slight part in the discussion of its conclusions. Without minimizing too greatly the influence of personalities in the abolitionist movement, William Lloyd Garrison for example, Phillips had become convinced that some powerful force not hitherto properly appreciated had worked upon the Northern mind to produce the crusade against slavery. At that time the letters and papers of Theodore Dwight Weld had not yet been discovered, and one may imagine the satisfaction which came when a large amount of documentary material turned up to corroborate and amplify the view which he had long since entertained.⁴

Phillips' later years at the University of Michigan may properly be regarded as among the happiest and most productive of his career. His rank in the profession was well established and honors of one kind and another came in rapid succession. A personal reminiscence may be offered at this point. On a spring afternoon in 1929, in acceptance of an invitation to spend a few days as his guest, I walked with him from the University Club to his home where we joined his children on the lawn. At the supper table there seemed to be an air of suppressed gaiety. Finally he broke into a rollicking laugh and said to Mrs. Phillips, "Tell him the news."

The news was that during the afternoon a message had come from the Albert Kahn Foundation tendering one of its fellowships for a year of foreign travel. This honor followed closely upon the award by Little, Brown and Company of the prize of \$2,500 offered for the best unpublished work on American history. In the evening the whole

³ Gilbert H. Barnes, *The Antislavery Impulse, 1830-1844* (New York, 1933).

⁴ The Weld Papers were later published in part in Gilbert H. Barnes and Dwight L. Dumond (eds.), *The Letters of Theodore Dwight Weld, Angelina Grimké Weld and Sarah Grimké*, 2 vols. (New York, 1934).

household went to the telegraph office to compose the reply of acceptance, following which a visit to a movie was added to celebrate the award.

There was a fine hospitality in the Phillips home at Ann Arbor. The large living room, with its great fireplace at one end, saw many a gathering of groups of workers in the field of history. During a meeting of the American Historical Association one such group enjoyed a most hilarious hour as Phillips discoursed in burlesque fashion on his alleged discovery of a rare piece of military biography. For others there are memories of quieter evenings when there was much good talk and sober discussion of the work done and being done in American history. At the risk of seeming to intrude upon the more personal side, mention might be made of the happy family life in which the guest was always given opportunity to join. An old-fashioned courtesy prevailed, with much merry laughter and banter between parents and children.

Phillips had the same zest for manuscripts that a fisherman might have for a trout stream. He was never happier than when on the trail of some hitherto unknown and unexplored cache, and his friend Herbert A. Kellar has recorded most interestingly some of their amusing adventures while on such quests in Virginia. He had himself gathered together an extensive collection of books and manuscripts, much of which passed into the Yale University Library after his death. His notes filled several filing cabinets and were kept in most orderly fashion. They were begun when, as a student assistant in the library of the University of Georgia where he was working for his master's degree, he was assigned the task of arranging a large lot of newspapers. While putting them in order he also examined their contents, made copious notes, and incidentally nearly ruined his eyesight. It was the eyestrain thus occasioned which forced him to withdraw for a time from college, a period during which he made his memorable essay as a cotton planter, an episode which is described in his *Life and Labor in the Old South*.

The use which he made of this personal experience in agriculture illustrates his manner of drawing upon the contemporary scene to throw light upon the past. He felt that too many historians became so occu-

pied in their research that they lost all contact with daily life and consequently could give no real meaning to the masses of facts which they so industriously collected. Phillips was no cloistered scholar. He lived and moved among men and knew that from the humblest and most illiterate there might come some illumination of the life of the past which he was seeking to interpret. One of his friends recalls an occasion when Phillips was the guest of a railroad attorney in a Southern city and with several hours before a dinner engagement was asked what he would like to do. He suggested that the ablest Negro preacher in the city might be brought in. This was done and for two hours or more his questions brought for him and for the others who were listeners interesting glimpses of the Negro mind in relation to the various subjects which were discussed. A Canadian friend who traveled with him from a historical gathering in the Middle West recalls that as they sat together at night in the smoking compartment the talk naturally turned upon the Negro in America. A porter who entered seemed to spend an unusually long time in his polishing duties. By and by another black face was at the door and then a third, all intently listening to the discussion, their presence and interest in no way resented by Phillips. His service during the World War in one of the cantonments in the South where Negro troops received training gave him interesting new glimpses of the African in America, and when the Kahn Foundation's fellowship provided him with both the time and the means to do what he pleased for a year in other countries his decision was quickly taken. He would go to Africa and there see the Negro race on its own continent, living even yet in some areas under conditions similar to those of the earliest forbears of the Negro in America. Here were human documents, as important for a true understanding of his subject as the most authentic letters and diaries and account books.

Phillips' use of the manuscript material which came before him showed fine discrimination. He was not deceived by the window dressing which so often characterizes the correspondence of political leaders. He recognized the value of the familiar correspondence of comparatively obscure persons as often a more trustworthy clue to public

opinion than official documents. American history had, he thought, been written too much upon the basis of what great men said on the public platform or wrote in an official capacity. He sought the facts of history in more lowly places and the use which he made of planters' diaries and account books and of the private letters of individual farmers is both interesting and instructive. It is easy to imagine the anticipation with which he visited "Shirley," the old Carter home on the James River, on a day in 1916 and had set before him for perusal the three large volumes of Hill Carter's diary, running from 1816 to 1851, and the volume of overseer's accounts from 1832 to 1845.⁵ But he could be thrilled equally by the illiterate writings of obscure individuals who, quite unconscious of the fact that they were providing the sources of history, set down in simple and artless phrases the happenings about them.⁶

Broadened and deepened knowledge of the field of history which he cultivated so assiduously was accompanied in the case of Phillips by an ever higher standard of literary presentation which reached its peak in his *Life and Labor in the Old South*. In the preface to the book he refers modestly to his own work, contrasting it with that of other writers less restricted by records and whose imagination could have free rein. "In the main I am content to delve rather than try to soar," he wrote, yet from the first page of the book where he says, "Let us begin by discussing the weather," there is not a dull page. The improvements in style which characterized his later writings came by dint of hard work. Phillips composed slowly and revised continuously. There are passages in his later work which are almost musical in their flow and choice of words. He loved to search for and find if possible that word which above all others expressed exactly the idea that was in his mind. The well-worn dictionary which was so prominent in his study had become so by the touch of his hands. His students were sometimes amused by his frequent use of the word "copious," a very excellent word by the way, but which seemed to be for him a special favorite. He used it in

⁵ Ulrich B. Phillips, *Life and Labor in the Old South* (Boston, 1929), 229.

⁶ *Ibid.*, Chap. XVII, "The Plain People."

familiar conversation and in lecturing, and it constantly recurs in his writings. Young scholars, seeking a model for historical composition, might learn much from his writings and profit also by examination of his use of footnotes. He himself thought that Edward Channing was a model in this latter branch of the writer's craft. Those who studied under Phillips soon came also to know of his deep interest in maps and to learn of his own experiments in map making.⁷ In his investigations of economic and political matters he had found that setting the facts in map form gave a conspectus not otherwise easy to secure and often provided interpretations more valid than those otherwise obtained.

Phillips valued highly the respect and affection of those able students who from year to year came under his direction. He himself retained such an affection for Frederick Jackson Turner, his former colleague, and appreciated those instances where he himself had been an inspiration to good work and found that inspiration acknowledged. He had no patience with those who sought by easy methods to seem to have that which could only come through diligence and perseverance. He was a man ever ready and willing to work with others. In the American Historical Association, in the Agricultural History Society, and in like organizations he was prepared at all times to do his part in furthering the objectives. To the very last of life, even in the midst of poignant suffering, he concerned himself with his responsibilities as teacher and counselor.

In personal appearance Phillips was tall and well-made. He was fair of skin and ruddy of countenance. His smile gave an impression of bashfulness but he had a marked dignity of presence and manner. When lecturing to undergraduate classes he sat at his desk, used no notes as a rule, and spoke in a quiet, measured fashion. He was more in his element when meeting the smaller seminar groups. There he would pose question after question in searching fashion, determining how thoroughly the individual had followed his inquiry. He was not a good extemporaneous public speaker but his written papers were presented in excellent style and voice.

⁷ For example, see the economic map of the South in 1860 which appears in *ibid.*

His last days were followed with sad hearts by those who were his associates and friends. A group in attendance at the Urbana meeting of the American Historical Association sent him a message of greeting and cheer during what were his last days. But he was not cast down, even with the shadows so close around him. He had lived richly, he had enriched the lives of others, and at the last he could have said, with Lord Bacon, "a mind fixed upon something that is good doth avert the dolours of death." Steps have already been taken to bring together a collection of essays by former students which will be their tribute to the memory of an inspiring teacher and a friend, one who lived in a spacious atmosphere and gave freshness and life to fields of history which narrow minds and prejudice had long muddled. In that volume it is to be hoped that there will be such adequate portrayal of the personality of Ulrich Phillips as shall preserve him a living figure to those who come after us who knew him.

SOUTHERN DESIGNS ON CUBA, 1854-1857
AND SOME EUROPEAN OPINIONS

Edited by GAVIN B. HENDERSON

The persistent bickering that disfigured Anglo-American relations during the nineteenth century was in one of its worst phases during the Crimean War period. The United States government was very suspicious of the Anglo-French alliance which, it was feared, might lead to co-operation in trans-Atlantic matters. On January 31, 1854, Lord Clarendon, the British foreign minister, made a speech in the House of Lords in which he declared: "the union between the two Governments has not been confined to the Eastern question. The happy accord and good understanding between France and England have been extended beyond Eastern policy to the policy affecting all parts of the world, and . . . there is no portion of the two hemispheres with regard to which the policy of the two countries, however heretofore antagonistic,

His last days were followed with sad hearts by those who were his associates and friends. A group in attendance at the Urbana meeting of the American Historical Association sent him a message of greeting and cheer during what were his last days. But he was not cast down, even with the shadows so close around him. He had lived richly, he had enriched the lives of others, and at the last he could have said, with Lord Bacon, "a mind fixed upon something that is good doth avert the dolours of death." Steps have already been taken to bring together a collection of essays by former students which will be their tribute to the memory of an inspiring teacher and a friend, one who lived in a spacious atmosphere and gave freshness and life to fields of history which narrow minds and prejudice had long muddled. In that volume it is to be hoped that there will be such adequate portrayal of the personality of Ulrich Phillips as shall preserve him a living figure to those who come after us who knew him.

SOUTHERN DESIGNS ON CUBA, 1854-1857
AND SOME EUROPEAN OPINIONS

Edited by GAVIN B. HENDERSON

The persistent bickering that disfigured Anglo-American relations during the nineteenth century was in one of its worst phases during the Crimean War period. The United States government was very suspicious of the Anglo-French alliance which, it was feared, might lead to co-operation in trans-Atlantic matters. On January 31, 1854, Lord Clarendon, the British foreign minister, made a speech in the House of Lords in which he declared: "the union between the two Governments has not been confined to the Eastern question. The happy accord and good understanding between France and England have been extended beyond Eastern policy to the policy affecting all parts of the world, and . . . there is no portion of the two hemispheres with regard to which the policy of the two countries, however heretofore antagonistic,

is not now in entire harmony." It is clear that these unimpeachable sentiments referred to the efforts of the two governments to bring to an end the traditional rivalry between French and British agents in all parts of the world. But the United States professed to see something specifically hostile to themselves in these words; and they considered the case proven when France refused to permit Pierre Soulé, American minister in Madrid, to pass through French territory on his way to Spain.

Meanwhile, there were numerous outstanding differences between Britain and the United States. The Oregon frontier, the Newfoundland fisheries, the Falkland Islands, and the Mosquito Coast—all provided material for diplomatic controversy. The American bombardment of Greytown and the project of annexing the Sandwich Islands added fuel to the flames. With Russia, on the other hand, there were no points of difference; and, throughout the Crimean War, the United States government was favorable to the Czar.¹ The American people fully agreed with their government. There were rejoicings in the United States when it was learned that the rumor of the fall of Sebastopol was false.² In December, 1854, the Mayor of New York and the District Attorney attended a meeting to present an address to Smith O'Brien on his return from Van Dieman's Land. Strongly anti-British speeches were made, and three cheers were given for the Czar of Russia.³

The strength of these anti-British feelings in the Northern, Central, and Western states of the Union seemed to provide a suitable opportunity for certain Southerners to carry through one of their dearest ambitions: namely, the acquisition of Cuba. This beautiful and wealthy island was not only of strategic and economic importance; it was of very special importance to Southern expansionists, who thought its

¹ See Frank A. Golder, "Russian-American Relations during the Crimean War," in *American Historical Review* (New York, 1895-), XXXI (1926), 462-76.

² Clarendon, British foreign secretary, to Aberdeen, prime minister, November 6, 1854, in Arthur Hamilton-Gordon (ed.), *Selections from the Correspondence of George, Earl of Aberdeen* (privately printed), Vol. for 1854-1855 (1885), 271. There is a copy of this rare series, which was printed for private circulation, in the manuscript room of the British Museum, which contains also the Aberdeen Papers in manuscript form.

³ Crampton to Clarendon, December 25, 1854, and enclosure from the New York *Herald*, Public Record Office, Foreign Office 5/600. Cited hereafter as P. R. O., F. O.

acquisition would greatly strengthen that slave-economy which they were determined to preserve at all costs. Everything seemed to make 1854 or 1855 a suitable time for the attempt. Spain was even weaker and more revolution-ridden than usual, and her despicable monarchy appeared on the verge of collapse. Britain and France—chief rivals of the United States in the Caribbean—were fully occupied elsewhere. A powerful effort was therefore made to convert the policy of the Southern expansionists into the policy of the Union itself.

Soulé, the firebrand United States minister in Madrid, appears to have been the leading spirit in this affair. He persuaded William L. Marcy to call a "conference" of the United States ministers accredited to the courts of London, Paris, and Madrid—namely, James Buchanan, John Y. Mason, and Soulé. Mason and Soulé were Southerners; Buchanan, though a Pennsylvanian, was a Democrat, and in full sympathy with them. "Never did I obey any instructions so reluctantly," wrote Buchanan later, ". . . and yet I continue to be entirely satisfied with our reports."⁴ The three ministers met at Ostend on October 9, 10, and 11, 1854. Another Southern diplomat, Dudley Mann, was in Ostend, and seems to have been consulted.⁵ From Ostend, the three ministers proceeded to Aix-la-Chapelle, where they produced a report (dated October 18) commonly known as the Ostend Manifesto. This report declared that the acquisition of Cuba by the United States, by purchase or by any other method, was a foregone conclusion; and that, if any other great power were to indicate an objection to such a plan, this should be regarded as a mere impertinence.⁶ The conference, and the

⁴ James Buchanan to William L. Marcy, December 22, 1854, in John B. Moore (ed.), *The Works of James Buchanan, Comprising his Speeches, State Papers, and Private Correspondence*, 12 vols. (New York, 1908-1911), IX, 289.

⁵ Van Iseghem, Hanoverian consul in Ostend, wrote to von Lenthe, Hanoverian foreign minister, on October 12, 1854 (No. 148) that the three ministers were "accompanied by several secretaries or attachés, and by Mr Dudley Mann, a member of the American cabinet." Hannover Staatsarchiv, Hannover 9 Türkei 27E. It seems doubtful whether Mann's presence was a pure coincidence or not. For Mann, see *Journal of Southern History* (Baton Rouge, 1935-), IV (1938), 219, n. 15.

⁶ See Moore (ed.), *Works of James Buchanan*, IX, 260-74, for the text of the Ostend Manifesto. In Britain this was of course regarded as a piece of "unparalleled audacity." See, for example, W. R. Greg, *Rocks Ahead, or the Warnings of Cassandra* (London, 1874), 208, 216.

report, were highly irregular: it was Southern policy, not Union policy, that was being expressed so forcibly. The authorities at Washington seem to have given the Southern diplomats freedom of expression with a view to testing opinion at home and abroad. But the gentlemen of the South had on this occasion gone too far: their report gave deep offence to the Free Soil party, which recognized that it adopted "the highwayman's plea, that might makes right."⁷ Pierce and Marcy, though always anxious to do a bad turn to Britain or a good turn to Russia, dared not give their full support to the Southern designs on Cuba,⁸ and, as a result, the opportunity of the Crimean War was lost. For the meanwhile, Cuba remained Spanish.

The Cuban question naturally excited interest in diplomatic and political circles in Europe, and particularly in Britain. Nowhere in Britain was there any sympathy for Southern aspirations until the noble struggle of the Confederacy attracted widespread admiration, though little concrete support. In the days of the Crimean War, Southern designs on Cuba and United States friendship with Russia were alike regarded as a base betrayal of democratic principles. In 1812-1814, when Britain was engaged in a desperate struggle against the autocrat, Napoleon, the United States—which had revolted in the name of liberty—had fought on the side of despotism. Such, at least, was the British interpretation. In 1854-1855 Britain was again engaged in a desperate struggle against an autocrat—and again the United States favored the upholder of despotism. Hence the British people—of all classes—were led to the conclusion that the great Republic of the West was not a true believer in democratic principles. And the explanation that naturally sprang to the mind was that a slave-economy was inherently incapable of being truly

⁷ The Free Soilers, and even more the abolitionists, were most despondent even before the publication of the Ostend Manifesto. On August 7, 1854, Wendell Phillips wrote to Mrs. Elizabeth Pease Nichol: ". . . the *Government* has fallen into the hands of the Slave Power *completely*. So far as *national* politics are concerned, we are beaten—there's no hope. We shall have Cuba in a year or two, Mexico in five." See W. P. Garrison and F. J. Garrison (eds.), *William Lloyd Garrison, 1805-1879, The Story of His Life Told by His Children*, 4 vols. (New York, 1885-1889) III, 411.

⁸ John A. Quitman, who was organizing an expedition against Cuba, was forced to pay some regard to the neutrality laws. But he was rewarded for his illegal activities with a seat in Congress.

democratic; and that, so long as the South had a powerful influence on the policy of the United States, that policy was certain to be antidemocratic and anti-British. The Southern hunger for Cuba was one of many factors responsible for building up this line of argument which, though largely mistaken, contained some elements of truth. A body of opinion developed in Britain which believed not only that Southerners were wicked men, because they practiced and justified slavery, but also that they were peculiarly anti-British, since Britain had freed her slaves and loved liberty. This complacent fantasy, which finds some slight justification in the irresponsibilities of the Ostend Manifesto, was not without importance, for it had significant results. Had British opinion been more pro-Southern in the days of the Confederacy the course of the struggle might have been altered.

It is therefore thought useful to print certain dispatches and letters to illustrate the course of events in Cuba, and the state of opinion in Europe, in the years 1854-1857. A number of dispatches from British representatives abroad have been selected from the British Public Record Office. Use has also been made of material from the private Clarendon Papers.⁹ These documents may be regarded as supplementing the text of the Ostend Manifesto which is, however, too easily accessible to need reproduction here.

W. H. HOLDERNESS TO PALMERSTON, ADAMS COUNTY, OHIO,
SEPTEMBER 22, 1854¹⁰

Your good sense will of course excuse any lack of etiquette that there may appear to be in this epistle especially as it comes from a resident on the Western side of the Atlantic, where courtly forms have not yet been introduced. I have just received information of matters that deeply concern, as I think, the whole of Europe, especially Spain. There is an expedition of immense magnitude now on foot in the United States for the subjugation of Cuba. General [John A.] Quitman is at the head of it. It is secretly organized, chiefly throughout the Slave States. General Quitman proposes raising 200000 men, of which I have been informed that 150000 are enrolled already. The place of rendezvous is New Or-

⁹ I am indebted to Lord Clarendon for permission to make use of material from his family papers.

¹⁰ P.R.O., F.O. America Domestic/611. The letter is marked "Private."

leans, where they also purpose to embark for their descent on the Island. The time they purpose for their expedition is next February.¹¹ The late conduct of the United States Government leaves no doubt that they will connive at it. You may depend on my information being correct. I had it from one who has been among the conspirators, and has seen their arms, a good part of which are revolving rifles, of seven barrels together. I have no motive that I know in giving this information, but to prevent, if possible, the consummation of as dark a piece of villainy as can disgrace the 19th century, to be carried out under the hypocritical pretext of enlarging the area of freedom. Beyond this communication, I wish not to be known in the matter.¹²

HOWDEN (BRITISH AMBASSADOR IN MADRID) TO CLARENDON (BRITISH FOREIGN MINISTER), NO. 269, OCTOBER 23, 1854¹³

I have just seen a private letter from Mr Soulé, dated Aix la Chapelle the 12th instant, in which he says that his absence from Madrid was never a Leave but "a grave and momentous Mission". He alludes no doubt to the Congress of American Ministers.

I have no doubt that in this Congress not only the republicanizing of Spain, but the republicanizing of Europe as a result, was debated. I gather this from the answer of the present Chargé d'Affaires here, Mr [Horatio J.] Perry, to Mr Soulé's letter.

Mr Soulé overwhelms Mr Perry with abuse for even the common terms of amity on which he has very wisely kept with the Spanish Government and its members. Mr Perry read me his reply, and I must say of the composition of this young man that it is one of the most earnest, right-minded and really eloquent productions I ever met.

In one part, to which I have alluded, Mr Perry says "You will fail in your objects, *nor will you have the consolation of pulling down Empires with you*,—it is my business to tell you the truth even if my destiny be in your hands. You have not a single real friend here, and I should be still more correct in saying that, excepting the Queen Mother, you are the being most hated in Spain."

It is really an astonishing fact, if the American President and Foreign Secretary do not approve of Mr Soulé's acts that they should allow him to jeopardise the wiser policy of the United States by what he may be inclined now to say or do. The letter I read was hot with anger, ambition, and vanity, and pregnant

¹¹ February, 1855, was in fact the critical month. See subsequent documents.

¹² This letter was communicated by Clarendon, British foreign secretary, to Crampton, British minister in Washington, on November 2, 1854. No. 246, F.O. 5 America/592.

¹³ P.R.O., F.O. 72 Spain/846. In a pencil note Clarendon instructed a copy of the above to be sent to Washington to Crampton "who will take care that Mr P's name is not divulged as holding communⁿ with L^d H."

with some great scheme. I learn that he counts on the out and out support in the American cabinet of Messieurs [Caleb] Cushing and [Jefferson] Davis.

It is very possible that all this violence, by its very excess, may defeat itself.

SEAFORD (BRITISH CHARGÉ D'AFFAIRES IN BRUSSELS) TO LORD CLARENDON,
NOVEMBER 1, 1854¹⁴

At a visit I paid yesterday to the chargé d'affaires of the United States, he let fall a few words which may not be uninteresting to Your Lordship, at the present moment, though they occurred in a conversation quite of a private and friendly character.

We were talking of the occurrences of the day, and I alluded to the incalculable importance and results to Europe of the alliance between France and England, when Mr [J. J.] Seibels remarked: "True as regards Europe but yet we do not *quite* like it in the United States."

I expressed my surprise asking how this could be, whether we had not their sympathy in our struggle with Russia, adding that I had been under the impression not only that their relations were excellent with us, but that there was always a special leaning on their part towards France.

He quite assented to this, but replied "there was a speech of Lord Clarendon's which has created great sensation and dissatisfaction with us."

I replied "surely there must be some mistake, as I never recollect Lord Clarendon saying anything of a nature which could be taken ill by the United States, and indeed I am sure that he could not really have said anything of the kind from my knowledge of his sentiments towards your country." Mr Seibels explained that it was by no means any expression of Your Lordship *distinctly directed* against them which had caused irritation but that in a speech in which you had alluded to the *immediate* importance to *Europe* of the actual alliance between France and England, you had given utterance to the expression of a confidence of this alliance being of a *permanent* nature, and *as such* attended with advantages to the *World*.

He added that they (in the United States) took this as a sort of menace to the United States, or at least intention to thwart them, and he went on to say "you know we want and must have Cuba, and we know that France, when acting with England, would oppose us."

I remarked "of course your territory is large enough for your prosperity, and your power is as great as it need be for self defence and for consideration as a leading people among nations, but your aggrandizement would in the opinion of many Countries render you dangerous to the peace of the World, but, I went on to say, as connected with Cuba a great principle of civilisation (to which the whole population of France and England attach the greatest importance)

¹⁴ P.R.O., F.O. 10 Belgium/182. The letter is marked "Private."

was *at least apparently involved*, that is the question of Slavery. There is, as you know, a reasonable expectation that something will be done by Spain towards the abolition of Slavery. Now we look upon the object of your policy in desiring to obtain possession of Cuba to be that of *the perpetuation* of Slavery. We know the dangerous character to you of the struggle going on between your Slave and Free States, and the project of transporting all your Slaves to Cuba, and indemnifying the Southern-States Slave owners by grants in Cuba (whether feasible or not) has been so often put forward, that credence is attached to what I have said was the apprehension would result from the occupation of Cuba." Mr Seibels laughed, and said he knew what was said in the United States and what was felt in England upon that subject, and he admitted the danger of the Slavery question as it now stood with them.

I then turned the conversation to the Meeting of the United States Ministers in what has been called "Congress" in Europe, thinking that I might learn something of the object, and whether the question of Cuba (that is to say the opportunity of making a dash at Cuba, as has been suspected) might have formed matter for deliberation, but he told me he had not been party to the meeting anywhere, and he was quite reserved upon the subject, if he knew in fact anything of the proceedings of this Assemblage of the United States Representatives.

Although I do not attach any special importance to what fell from Mr Seibels, yet being a thorough American and a Slave Owner, the sentiments he expressed to me are fairly to be looked upon as genuine, and as indicating correctly those of certain classes in the United States at this moment.

HOWDEN TO CLARENDON, NO. 299, MADRID, NOVEMBER 10, 1854¹⁵

There is expressed by all the Ministers, declared by all the journals, and believed by all the Publick, a *confident expectation* that England will protect Cuba against the Americans, and the present Policy of Spain itself against any power or party that attacks it. The strength of Spain as regards the rest of Europe has been long that of a woman:— She knows that she is too weak to be struck. . . . I cannot divest myself of the conviction that Cuba is destined to become, before long, a serious embarrassment not only for the Mother Country but for England. I am sure that Spain rests her expectation of retaining the Island *entirely* on England and France: She says (perhaps she says rightly) that the English Antilles make Cuba as much an English as a Spanish question, but I earnestly request Your Lordship to believe that the result of this argumentation is that Spain will never be even grateful for the protection of England, or do anything to merit it. . . .

¹⁵ P.R.O., F.O. 72 Spain/847. There was more than one opinion in the British cabinet as to whether "the English Antilles make Cuba as much an English as a Spanish question." On December 9 Lord John Russell wrote to Clarendon: "This Washington chit-chat seems to me rather probable, and agrees with what 'Old Buck' [Buchanan] has said here. I think

DRAFT: CLARENDON TO LORD HOWARD DE WALDEN (BRITISH AMBASSADOR
IN BELGIUM), NOVEMBER 11, 1854¹⁶

I have received Your Lordship's Despatch marked "Private" of the 1st instant giving an account of a Conversation which you had on the 31st ultimo with the Chargé d'Affaires of the United States at Brussels; and I have to acquaint you that I approve the language which Your Lordship held on that occasion. I am well aware of the objection taken in the United States to a passage in a speech of mine at the beginning of last Session, and I have explained frequently both to the American Minister here as well as to Mr [John F. T. C.] Crampton that no reference to the United States whatever, direct or indirect, was intended nor was in my mind at the time, and that I merely alluded to the joint Missions of England and France to some of the South American States.

In justification of the views entertained by certain Parties in the United States respecting Cuba, the most absurd rumours had been industriously circulated of the intention of Her Majesty's Govt. to "Africanize" Cuba, and that negotiations were actually in progress for the emancipation of the Slaves in that Island, but the only desire of Her Majesty's Government is that Cuba should remain in the possession of its lawful sovereign while their communications to the Spanish Govt. have been confined to remonstrances against the perpetual violations of the Treaty between Great Britain and Spain for abolishing the Slave Trade.

You will, in the manner you may think most expedient, make this known to your American colleague.

HOWDEN TO CLARENDON, NO. 301, MADRID, NOVEMBER 12, 1854¹⁷

Some time ago I told Your Lordship that I felt almost convinced that Mr Soulé had entered into no contract either with the Queen Mother or the late Government for the sale of Cuba, but I have very great reason to believe that a contract was not only projected but even prepared between Mr Soulé and Señores [José Maria] Orense and Ordax Avecilla, the heads of the Republican Party here, for the sale of the Island whenever, through Mr Soulé's assistance and the money supplied by the United States, that party came into power.

That this idea, and even more than an idea, was discussed, I can almost posit—we should try to come to an understanding with France about Cuba. If Spain sells it, let her. If Cuba revolts, let it. But if Pierce attempts to take Cuba by force I should not allow it." Clarendon Papers. Hence Russell did not object to a United States acquisition *in itself*, e.g., by purchase; but he objected to its acquisition *by violence*—an acquisition which might encourage Southern filibusters to start operations on British colonial possessions.

¹⁶ P.R.O., F.O. 10 Belgium/179. The letter is marked "Separate and Private." There is a marginal note as follows: "Should not this await till Lord H. de Walden returns? Yes, but it may be sent to Ld. H. at Paris and to care of Ld. Cowley. C[Clarendon]."

¹⁷ P.R.O., F.O. 72 Spain/847.

tively inform Your Lordship, but as far as my experience goes of the feeling of this Country at large, a feeling entertained very widely by people of all parties, even by those who are most democratick in their opinions, I can not think this Sale would ever be executed with the sanction of a Representative assembly by any Ministry under any form of government.

HOWDEN TO CLARENDON, NO. 349, DECEMBER 13, 1854¹⁸

[Howden gives a more friendly account of Soulé, and continues:] In speaking of Cuba, Mr Soulé said he did not think there would be any more filibustering attacks, but that the universal feeling of the Country would force its acquisition on the Government; that the Government would be absolutely obliged to do so in its own defence, in order to allay a universal and overpowering excitement, in the same way that, by every law natural or made, a man was justified in knocking down his neighbour's wall to put out a fire which threatened the conflagration of his property.

CRAMPTON TO CLARENDON, NO. 20, JANUARY 22, 1855¹⁹

I have the honour to inform your Lordship that M. Pierre Soulé, Minister from the United States to Spain, has resigned his appointment and that Mr John C. Breckenridge [*sic*] of Kentucky has been named by the President to be M. Soulé's successor. This appointment has been confirmed by the Senate.

Mr Breckenridge who has represented a district of the State of Kentucky in the House of Representatives, although comparatively a young man, has gained a respectable standing in Congress and is a person of good character and conciliatory manners. He has never that I am aware of committed himself publicly or privately to any political opinions regarding the relations between this Country and Spain, which could fairly give umbrage to the Government of Her Most Christian Majesty.

ARTHUR FANSHAWE (BRITISH ADMIRAL) TO CRAMPTON, HAVANA,
FEBRUARY 6, 1855²⁰

I arrived here on the 1st inst with the "Colossus". I have had a very cordial reception from the Captain General and Spanish Authorities and he has given me to understand my visit is an opportune one, as he had reason, from information he had received, to expect the arrival of a filibustering expedition under Colonel Quitman,—and certainly since my arrival there have been some symptoms of activity with the Spanish Squadron and troops. A frigate, two brigs and

¹⁸ P.R.O., F.O. 72 Spain/848. Soulé's simile about a conflagration is an echo of the terms of the Ostend Manifesto.

¹⁹ P.R.O., F.O. 5 America/619.

²⁰ P.R.O., F.O. 5 America/619. Crampton sent this letter to Clarendon and in his covering letter, dated February 18, 1855, No. 36, he says that, in spite of all American pro-

three steamers have gone to sea, taking the General second in command and some troops. General [José de la] Concha assures me he is well prepared to receive them, he would only wish to be sure of the point of debarkation.

My own opinion is that these movements have more reference to some apprehended *insurrection* in the Island than invasion.

The American Consul tells me he has assured the Captain General [Concha] his apprehensions are groundless—that the President is entirely adverse to any filibustering and that the adventurers have exhausted their funds and Mr[A. C.] Crawford says he has heard nothing from any of his Brother-Consuls in the States. The Spanish Squadron, and I may say also the Spanish troops, appear in a much more efficient state than any I have seen for a long time. . . .

CRAWFORD (BRITISH CONSUL IN HAVANA) TO CLARENDON, No. 11,
FEBRUARY 10, 1855²¹

I have to report to Your Lordship that a plot for the subversion of the Government and of Spanish Rule in this Island has been discovered, and numerous persons have been arrested here and elsewhere who are said to be implicated in the conspiracy. So completely effectual have been the measures of General Concha on this occasion, that the papers of those arrested were seized and I understand have been found to disclose a plan in combination with an expedition which was to have sailed about this time from certain parts of the United States in aid of the insurrectionists in the Island, as well as that there have been considerable depots of arms and ammunition established at various places, which were brought from America, the money for the purposes of the conspirators having been furnished by those engaged in it here and elsewhere in Cuba to a large amount.

These arrests were made on Tuesday last the 6th instant at all places simultaneously and some sixty persons have been made prisoners, chiefly Creoles, but there are several Spaniards amongst them. I have not heard that any foreigners have been taken, although it is said that emissaries from the United States are at various places, they have managed until now to avoid capture.

The parties accused are to be tried by the Military Commission and General Concha has assured me that he feels perfectly secure as to any consequences which might result even if the whole force estimated at 2300 or 2600 men were to effect a landing, as he is prepared for them at all points.

I have the honour of transmitting to Your Lordship the Diario of today, which republishes an official notice published by the Captain General which appeared in yesterday's Gazette upon this subject, and also some particulars of testations, "I fear there can be little doubt that had the proposed insurrection in Cuba been even partially successful no efforts of the United States Govt. could have prevented the departure of numbers of persons from this country to join its ranks."

²¹ P.R.O., F.O. 72 Spain/878.

the Filibuster Expedition which it appears was to have come from Texas, Savannah, and New York.

The public tranquillity has in no way been disturbed in the Island, and the Manifesto of the Captain General has in a great degree tended to calm the alarm which could not fail to have been produced by the action of the Government which has been so energetically displayed.

Rear-Admiral Fanshawe C. B. arrived here on the 1st Instant in the "Boscawen" 72, accompanied by the "Colossus" 81. The "Espiegle" 12 was in port, and "Vestal" 26 has since arrived. The Colossus sailed yesterday on her return to England.

The Commander in Chief of Her Majesty's Naval Forces in these Seas has met a most cordial reception, and the presence of our Fleet here at so critical a moment cannot fail to have been exceedingly opportune and agreeable to His Excellency the Captain General by its moral effect, which I believe General Concha has acknowledged and expressed to Admiral Fanshawe who will remain until he receives his Despatches by H. M.'s Steamer "Medea" expected in a few days from Jamaica.

CRAWFORD TO CLARENDON, NO. 12, FEBRUARY 14, 1855²²

With reference to my last despatch No. 11 of the 10th Instant and inclosure I have now to report that General Concha has declared the Island to be in a State of Siege and the whole of the Coast and Islands adjacent to be blockaded by the Spanish Naval Forces. . . .

Those measures have been resorted to, as I understand, in consequence of information which the Captain-General has received which leads him to apprehend that a part of the Expedition, which it was said was ready to leave the United States, had actually sailed.

Admiral Fanshawe had an interview with General Concha yesterday after the "Bandos" were published and His Excellency stated that there was no doubt of a considerable part of the piratical forces having left New Orleans and Galveston, which required him to reinforce the Spanish Garrison at Trinidad and he applied to the Admiral for a steamer to convey troops from hence to that place.

In consequence of the official request which was addressed to him for that purpose, Admiral Fanshawe placed Her Majesty's Steamer Sloop Medea at His Excellency's disposition, and having embarked a wing of the Regiment of Iberia, the Medea sailed today at noon for Trinidad, from whence Commander Phillimore has orders to return as soon as said troops have been disembarked. . . .

²² P.R.O., F.O. 72 Spain/878. Crawford's letter of February 23, 1855, No. 16, says that there was no risk of a filibustering expedition, and that Concha's preparations seem to have been on an unnecessarily large scale. The "state of siege" in Cuba, declared on February 12, 1855, was raised by a proclamation of May 23, 1855. See Crawford to Clarendon, No. 36, May 24, 1855, in P.R.O., F.O. 72 Spain/878.

The proclamations of yesterday appear to have produced great enthusiasm among the Spanish inhabitants, a great number of them have been enrolled, amongst them most of the wealthy and Influential, and they are to be embodied forthwith for the defence of the Island. . . .

HOWDEN TO CLARENDON, No. 91, MARCH 4, 1855²³

The Government received last night a telegraphick dispatch from Cadiz, stating that a Spanish Man of War had arrived from the Havana bringing accounts of a serious conspiracy which had been discovered and frustrated. The assassination of the Captain General Concha in the theatre was to have been the signal for the conspirators. It appears that the plan was known to, and supported by, a party in the United States, as the American Government had stopped a vessel which was on the point of sailing. At the time of the Spanish Steamer leaving the Havana thirty arrests had been made, and the Spanish Government speak in very laudatory terms of the conduct of that of the United States.

HOWDEN TO CLARENDON, No. 103, MARCH 10, 1855²⁴

I have seen a private letter from a person in a highly respectable position in Cuba to his family, and on subjects of private and material interest which leave no doubt that his utmost intelligence and means of observation have been exercised. He says that although the last attempt at insurrection has been frustrated, there will be another and another till the object is attained, with the probability of a general massacre of the "Godos" or born Spaniards. The letter is in reference to very large sums which now are placed in Cuba at the extraordinarily advantageous interest of 12 per cent and he recommends their being transferred to Spain or elsewhere for the sake of security, and for whatever they may bring. The belief in the Havana is that the Captain General has secret orders, in case of an insurrection appearing successful, to proclaim the general emancipation of the Negroes, and to trust to the troops, and to any chance that turn up from the fearful scenes of blood which would ensue, for the re-establishment of the Spanish rule.

LORD NAPIER (BRITISH MINISTER IN WASHINGTON) TO CLARENDON,
No. 80, MAY 26, 1857²⁵

[It is certain that the acquisition of Cuba by the United States] is contemplated with avowed or secret favour in every portion of the Union, and that it is the capital object on which the President has fastened his hopes for popularity now and fame hereafter. Your Lordship will therefore be prepared for the dis-

²³ P.R.O., F.O. 72 Spain/865.

²⁴ P.R.O., F.O. 72 Spain/865.

²⁵ P.R.O., F.O. 5 America/671.

closure of the design at no distant date, and as it is one by which the interests and sentiments of the English people are alike affected, it is worthy of timely and dispassionate examination.

I submit the following reflections to Your Lordship with the greater hesitation because they point to conclusions at variance with prevailing opinions and my own first impressions; these remarks are consequently offered in a suggestive and not in a confident spirit.

The annexation of Cuba to the United States by pecuniary negotiation may be recommended to Great Britain by several arguments—

- [(i) The United States tariff is lower than that of Spain, so British trade would gain.
- (ii) Production of sugar, tobacco, and coffee—commodities which are all needed in Britain and which are all rising in price—would increase.
- (iii) British shipping would benefit.
- (iv) Spain would gain 30 to 40 millions sterling for Cuba. She would be able to pay $\frac{4}{5}$ of her foreign debt, and undertake great public works. Spain's new prosperity would increase British commerce.
- (v) Cuba is more easily attacked than any part of the United States, which would thus become more conciliatory towards Britain.
- (vi) If the United States do not buy Cuba, they may get the Island by war or revolution.
- (vii) The Cuban slave trade would be abolished.]
- (viii) The transfer of Cuba would allay a feeling of uneasiness and jealousy in reference to Great Britain which is fermenting to a greater extent in the United States than is generally allowed. It is imagined here that England forms part of a European Confederacy formed for the purpose of counteracting the extension of the United States in that quarter. . . .

. . . If Her Majesty's Government, on deliberation, resolve that the Interests of Great Britain are not attached to the preservation of Cuba by Spain, it would be desirable that Your Lordship should authorize me to inform the President that the attitude of Great Britain in this matter is one of perfect neutrality. The claims of Her Majesty's subjects would then secure a more benevolent consideration in the pecuniary settlement, the wishes of Her Majesty's Government would obtain a friendly hearing on other questions, and the triumph of American ambition would be associated with grateful sentiments towards England.²⁶

²⁶ Minute by Lord Clarendon, July 31, 1857: "This has remained so long without an answ. that it is perhaps not worth while to answ. it now and I have told Ld. N. privately that we altogether differed from him."

MINUTE BY PALMERSTON, JUNE 18, 1857, REFERRING TO LORD NAPIER'S
DISPATCH, NO. 80²⁷

This dispatch is not written with the good sense and judgement which naturally belong to Ld. Napier. It is evidently the detailed Exposition of views arguments and opinions instilled into him by the Govt. and others in the United States. It is a Tissue of Fallacies and Sophistries. It is to place on the narrow ground of Shopkeeping Considerations a Question which involves in its ultimate Issue the Jeopardy of valuable Possessions of the British Crown in the West Indies, and increased Dangers to our Floating Commerce. As to the argument that Concession as to Cuba would secure to England the permanent goodwill and future Forbearance of the United States, this is the worn-out argument used by the mouthpieces of the Americans at each step of Encroachment on their Part. This was to be the result of the Concession made to them by the Ashburton Treaty. This again was the motive urged for the Oregon arrangement. This is now put forward about Cuba and this would be repeated when successive Proofs of our weakness and gullibility shall have encouraged them to demand our North American Provinces. I think Napier should have a Hint to cast one Eye at least to the Eastern Shores of the Atlantic and to remember that he has not become a naturalized Citizen of the Union. Moreover besides British Interests there is good Faith to Spain not to be lost sight of.

PALMERSTON TO CLARENDON, JULY 4, 1857²⁸

Napier takes a narrow and limited view of the Results of United States extension, and forgets that we have West Indian Colonies. As to propitiating the Yankees by countenancing their schemes of annexation it would be like propitiating an animal of Prey by giving him one of one's Travelling Companions. It would increase his desire for similar food and spur him on to obtain it.

Napier should keep his opinions to himself and not try to make Popularity Capital by proclaiming them.

There can be little doubt that in the Course of time the Anglo-Saxon Race will spread far South in America, but it is for our Interest that this should not happen until the swarms are prepared to separate from the Parent Hive.

²⁷ Clarendon Papers.

²⁸ Clarendon Papers.

Book Reviews

The History of History. Volume I. By James T. Shotwell. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1939. Pp. xii, 407. Illustrations, bibliography. \$3.75.)

This volume, the first of a set of two, is a revision of Professor Shotwell's *An Introduction to the History of History* published in 1922. It presents a survey of ancient historiography that closes with the age of the Church Fathers. As the author explains in the preface, he has been heavily indebted in his work of revision to the suggestions of Professor J. W. Swain of the University of Illinois who is extensively quoted throughout the volume.

Part I opens with lucid and suggestive chapters on the nature of history and its interpretation. History, says the author, "is the manifestation of life, and behind each event is some effort of mind and will, while within each circumstance exists some power to stimulate or to obstruct" (p. 15). "Less ambitious than theological, philosophical, or even economic theories, it views itself as part of the very process which it attempts to understand. If it has no ecstatic glimpses of finality, it shares at least to the full the exhilaration of the scientific quest" (p. 35). The antecedents of history in myth, legend, and epic are discussed, after which the author rapidly reviews the evolution of ancient scripts and methods of chronological computation. The sources for the history of the Ancient Near East are then briefly described, with one chapter devoted to Egyptian annals and another to the king lists and inscriptions of Babylonia, Assyria, and Persia.

An analysis of Jewish historical literature comprises the whole of Part II; recent theories in regard to the evolution of the scriptural canon are discussed in scholarly fashion, and the works of Josephus are adequately appraised. Parts III and IV present Greek and Roman historiography. The author properly emphasizes the fact that the rise of criticism in the cities of Ionia created a skeptical attitude toward the works of Homer and Hesiod that was a necessary prelude to the epoch-making achievement of Herodotus. The differences between the Greek and Roman approaches to history are skillfully sketched and serve admirably to introduce the sections on Cato, Fabius Pictor, Livy, Tacitus, and other Roman historians.

The volume closes with a survey of the influence of Christianity on history writing. The ascetic ideal, allegorical interpretation, and chronological manipu-

lation enabled the Church Fathers to evolve what for them was the only true philosophy of history. The result was that "The authority of a revealed religion sanctioned but one scheme of history through the vast and intricate evolution of the antique world. A well-nigh insurmountable obstacle was erected to scientific inquiry—one at least which has taken almost nineteen centuries to surmount" (p. 333).

Professor Shotwell's treatment of the Greek and Roman historians is excellent. He avoids the extravagancies of orthodox appreciation and refrains from the modern tendency to disparage the works of the ancients because they fail to measure up to the standards of current historical writing. As he says of Thucydides, "To see in the author of the *Peloponnesian War* a 'modern of moderns,' facing history as we do, equipped with the understanding of the forces of history such as the historian of today possesses, is to indulge in an anachronism almost as naïve as the failure to appreciate Thucydides because he lacks it" (p. 201)!

In a volume of such broad outlook, questions of proportion inevitably will be raised. In the main, the treatment is well balanced, although some exception might be taken to the relatively lengthy discussion of Jewish historiography. The development of alphabets might well be discussed, and a few paragraphs on the decipherments of the Rosetta Stone and the Behistun Inscription should have been included. In the opinion of the reviewer, the relationships between history and the auxiliary sciences should have been more clearly established.

The book is characterized by the felicity of literary style which historians have learned to anticipate in Professor Shotwell's work. A carefully prepared bibliography is included, although few citations to the most recent works are found in the footnotes. The index is adequate and partially analytical. The format of the volume is on the whole pleasing, although the illustrative equipment is meager.

Louisiana State University

CHARLES EDWARD SMITH

The Early Writings of Frederick Jackson Turner. With a List of All His Works.

Compiled by Everett E. Edwards. (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1938. Pp. xi, 316. Bibliography, frontispiece, appendix. \$3.50.)

This volume contains the first four of Turner's historical compositions. The earliest and the longest is his monograph, "The Character and Influence of the Indian Trade in Wisconsin." Originally accepted as a dissertation for the Master of Arts degree in the University of Wisconsin, it was first published in 1889 in the *Proceedings* of the Wisconsin State Historical Society. In the following year it was accepted in a "rewritten and enlarged" form as a doctoral thesis at the Johns Hopkins University and soon appeared in the Johns Hopkins University *Studies in Historical and Political Science*. The records of the University do not

reveal any contemporary evaluation of Turner's monograph other than the fact that it was approved. As one of those whose duty it is to pass upon dissertations in history at that University, I have tried to ascertain, as well as I can, what my opinion of it would be if it were now being submitted. Of course, there are serious obstacles to such a judgment. In the first place, I cannot forget that the author is Frederick Jackson Turner. In the second place, I know nothing about the fur trade in Wisconsin, or elsewhere, so that I cannot estimate fairly the extent of his contribution. And thirdly, the standards of the scholarly profession respecting dissertations have changed. Wisely or unwisely, the tendency now is to require more extended pieces of research than those accepted in 1890. Nevertheless, after making all allowances, my conclusion is that I would not have rated the dissertation highly nor would I have foreseen the future greatness of its author. There are obvious defects in proportion and in organization. There is little or no evidence of the creative imagination or of the power to think profoundly which he was so soon to prove he possessed in abundance. I may have missed these qualities or, if he already had them, the dissertation may have suffered from the self-consciousness and the feeling of restriction that blight so many doctoral dissertations.

The intellectual distinction which one associates with Turner's work was clearly apparent in his second piece of historical writing. It was published in 1891 in the *Wisconsin Journal of Education* as "The Significance of History." Challenged by the initiation of university extension courses, Turner wrote this essay to explain "the utility of historical studies" and the current trends of historical writing. Obviously he had been thinking deeply on these subjects and his conclusions will be valued by students of American historiography.

The extraordinary originality of the man and his fertility in ideas are fully revealed in the third essay which appeared, of all places, in an undergraduate magazine and which is now first reprinted. By then, 1892, he had achieved his great generalization—"This ever retreating frontier of free land is the key to American development." Under the title "Problems in American History," he suggested various applications of that idea to the facts of American history. This short article charted the work of an entire school of historical writers during the following two generations and the end is not yet.

His fourth essay was the famous one on "The Significance of the Frontier in American History." It is reprinted in its original form, but an appendix contains the relatively few changes Turner made in its later versions.

Inevitably one looks to see if these essays explain the origin of Turner's thesis. The introduction by Mr. Fulmer Mood is largely devoted to a consideration of that question. It will be read with interest not only by students of Turner and of historiography but also by a wider group who wish to study the process by which new and fruitful ideas are formulated. To what he has said a further suggestion may be added. No one can read the last three of these

essays without noting the numerous references to evolution and the frequent use of biological analogies. Though the terms are not employed in the dissertation, there are portions of it, too, which are devoted to an account of the influence of environment on human activities. Is it not possible that the science which furnished him with a terminology also supplied him with the idea? Darwinian theories were much debated in America during these very years and Turner's frontier hypothesis may well have been one of the earliest and most successful applications of Darwinism to history.

The Johns Hopkins University

W. STULL HOLT

A Handbook of Oklahoma Writers. By Mary Hays Marable and Elaine Boylan. (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1939. Pp. xiii, 308. Bibliography. \$2.50.)

This volume represents several years of research on the part of two trained librarians, based on the materials which have been gathered from various elusive sources. After a careful perusal of this book, one is convinced of the growth of this new state, Oklahoma, and of a commendable increase in the number of authors who have attained statewide and national recognition as writers. It may be termed a literary "Who's Who of Oklahoma," but not a literary history. In the years to come such a work may be written, at which time it will be necessary to take into account *A Handbook of Oklahoma Writers*. This volume fills a long-felt need. It will prove a valuable source of reference for librarians, students, club members, and others interested in Oklahoma writers. It will also prove a welcome aid to those people who, here and there in the state of Oklahoma, are gathering collections of works dealing with the state.

Biography and bibliography are both included. Oklahoma authors are divided into the following classifications: novelists and short-story writers; poets; dramatists; historians and writers of general nonfiction. There should have been included, it seems to the reviewer, a chapter devoted to biographers. Several well-known Oklahoma authors are listed in other categories who are generally thought of, primarily, as biographers. It is difficult, however, to place some writers in just one classification, and many notable Oklahoma authors could be included in several fields of writing. One omission in the biographical sketches is that of Captain W. S. Nye, the scholarly author of *Carbine and Lance, the Story of Old Fort Sill*, although he is listed in the section devoted to bibliography of writers. The authors of this book should have recast their treatment of some of these sketches, several of which are too laudatory. It is true that Mrs. Marable and Miss Boylan state that some of the material was supplied by the writers themselves. In justice to the authors of this volume it should be stated that a difficult problem was faced in gathering their materials from widely scattered sources. A commendable feature of *A Handbook of Oklahoma Writers* is

the town list of writers. Here, too, there are noticeable omissions. There is also a list of literary awards and distinctions which have been won by Oklahomans. A noteworthy contribution has been made in the "Bibliography of Writers," which is both comprehensive and accurate, although here and there the reviewer detects the omission of certain titles which should have been included.

The authors impress the reader with a commendable familiarity with their subject. It seems unfortunate that they should not have brought their manuscript down to date in several instances. In their "Acknowledgements" they should have been more accurate in checking their statements as to the positions held by some of the people who aided them. However, the authors are to be congratulated upon their thoughtfulness in making available a worthwhile handbook which will prove invaluable in the years to come.

The University of Oklahoma Press is to be commended for the excellent typography and attractive format of this interesting volume.

Oklahoma Historical Society

JAMES W. MOFFITT

Jamestown and St. Mary's, Buried Cities of Romance. By Henry Chandlee Forman. (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1938. Pp. xvii, 355. Illustrations, maps. \$4.50.)

Mr. Forman presents a uniquely interesting contribution to an understanding of the mode of life in these two focal points of seventeenth century Virginia and Maryland. He has served as chief architect of the Jamestown Archaeological Project for the United States Department of the Interior, and as assistant head of the Historic American Buildings Survey. As would be expected, the book is primarily concerned with architecture, and is based largely on archaeological investigations. Chapters relating to Jamestown are in the nature of a report of the findings of the Archaeological Project as to the size, style, materials, and decorative devices of buildings that stood two and a half centuries and more ago. Mr. Forman has followed up the work there by independent diggings of his own at St. Mary's, which included the foundations of the first Chapel, of Smith's Town House, and of the Secretary's Office or the Old Court House. An attractive feature of the book, adding much to its value, is provided by sixty-eight illustrations. Some are photographic. Many, and among the most interesting, are sketches made by the author. Subjects include tiles, hinges, case-ments, etc., recovered by excavation, and conjectural drawings of buildings based on a study of foundations and of known architectural patterns of both the old and the new world. Several maps, especially the two that serve as end papers, call for important revisions in heretofore popular conceptions of the plan and growth of the two towns.

Many of the questions raised are of the sort with which no mere historian should meddle. "The places where a colonial government used to meet," to

quote the author, "are revered spots." Regarded with equal reverence, it may be added, are those places where colonial forefathers first set foot on American soil, where they first worshipped, and where they first lived and died. It is natural that these places should become shrines of family, state, and national devotion; that self-appointed priests, and priestesses, should appear to confound the doubter by citation to chapter and verse of both record and tradition; that mistakes should be made and rivalries develop; and that around contending claims strong vested interests should grow. These matters are in themselves fields of specialization. The professional historian, lacking both the necessary time and the inclination to compete, is well advised to stand clear. Perhaps, then, the reviewer will be permitted merely to note that, of the questions of this sort raised, the most important has to do with the site of the original settlement at Jamestown. Mr. Forman places it approximately half a mile below the old church tower that stands within the grounds of the Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities. His contention is supported by persuasive arguments.

More important is his contribution to an understanding of the people who inhabited these lost cities. A full portrait is impossible, but he has sketched for us additional lines to stimulate and guide the imagination. Here we glimpse a people whose life was limited by the hard necessities of frontier conditions, and yet a people who never fully surrendered to those conditions, whose love of grace and beauty managed somehow to find expression in the simplest of buildings, whose hopes and plans often exceeded their immediate capacities. Much of the story is summed up in that of the Maryland statehouse of 1676. In conception, it was "one of the half dozen or so really outstanding structures of the seventeenth century, and of the English race, in this country." As built, its roof leaked practically from the time of its completion, its condition after six years was "ruinous," and with another six years its "decayed" state required still further repairs. With 1694 it was abandoned, along with St. Mary's, as the seat of government.

Mr. Forman's archaeological investigations have been supplemented by an apparently full and careful examination of contemporary records. In the use of these he is for the most part, but not always, skillful. For example (p. 154), a bequest in 1636 to "a new church at James Cittie" cannot be taken as evidence that the "new church" was already constructed. A more serious criticism is invited by the attempt to describe an early colonial city without giving adequate attention to the basic economic pattern of the colony. This applies particularly to his discussion of early Jamestown. Through the years under the company there was at all times a definite, although frequently changing, plan of economic development. The plan, location, and growth of the town must obviously have been related to these larger plans. Finally, many will want to take issue with the author's encouragement of further attempts to reconstruct lost colonial

buildings. It is time perhaps to emphasize the fact that the opportunity at Williamsburg was unique. There is no other quite like it, and we have no guarantee that further work of the sort will be done with the same care and success. At best the result is merely a reproduction, and not the genuine article. At less than the best it is merely misdirected energy resulting in misleading impressions. Would not the time and money required be better directed to such projects as the care and preservation of documentary records, or to the compiling of other such useful books as is this one?

New York University

WESLEY FRANK CRAVEN

Thomas Clarkson: The Friend of Slaves. By Earl Leslie Griggs. (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1938. Pp. 210. Bibliography, illustrations. \$3.50.)

This study is a biographical sketch of the British reformer whose name is identified with the abolition of the African slave trade. The author had unusual facilities for a definitive study. He had access to all the Clarkson manuscripts and to unpublished letters of Clarkson's friends and co-workers; he had the generous co-operation of many scholars in England, and the services of research assistants in this country; his project was furthered by university research funds and a grant-in-aid. The mere accumulation of material must have been monumental but the study itself is sketchy and trite.

Doubtless this is partly due to the fact that the author accepts the traditional appraisal of Clarkson as a great man on his own account and a leader in the movement. Clarkson, however, was not a leader; his position was a subordinate one, and his labors, however useful, were concerned with details of the movement. Moreover, he had no distinction either of ability or of charm; in person he was mediocre and unattractive. Indeed, the contrast between Clarkson's dogged mediocrity and the brilliance of his associates, Brougham, Wilberforce, Macaulay, Charles Fox, and the younger Pitt, was remarked by his contemporaries, and was forgotten only when time had left nothing of them all but their reputations.

Among these famous men Clarkson was distinguished by his single-minded devotion to the abolition of the slave trade and his prodigious energy in furthering it by travel and correspondence. Of all the group, Clarkson alone was the exclusive representative of the cause in the public eye, its pioneer pamphleteer and agent. Though his significant service covered only eight years, from 1785 to 1793, when his health broke from overwork, that service had so identified his name with the movement that its final success in 1807 was considered by reformers everywhere as his victory too; and their acclaim made for Clarkson a notable place in history.

Though he lived on until 1846, through the movement to abolish slavery in the West Indies, and the transfer of that agitation to America, Clarkson's later influence was negligible: in his own person he was little more than a symbol of past antislavery achievement, until he died.

Writing as he does to justify his subject's place in history, the author adds little to standard accounts of Clarkson's contribution to the agitation. His two abortive trips to Europe on antislavery missions are well recounted, and his home life in later years is described in some detail; but the eight years of his gigantic labors, during which he traveled more than thirty-five thousand miles for the cause, are all too briefly told. The usefulness even of this summary is lessened by the absence of references to sources, as is the case throughout the book. Inaccuracies, however, are few. The American abolitionist mentioned on pages 151 and 186-87 was not Benjamin, but Henry Brewster Stanton. In the account of the controversy between Clarkson and the sons of Wilberforce, described in Chapter XII, the document most important to the controversy, Clarkson's quaint chart of the abolition movement in his *History . . . of the Abolition of the African Slave Trade*, is not even mentioned.

Ohio Wesleyan University

GILBERT H. BARNES

Liberal Kentucky, 1780-1828. By Niels Henry Sonne. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1939. Pp. ix, 287. Bibliography. \$3.00.)

In this book the author maintains that the leaders of early Kentucky were freethinkers whose liberalism was derived from their Virginia experience, nourished by the reading of Voltaire, Jefferson, Thomas Paine, and kindred spirits, and expressed by an advocacy of the separation of church and state, of the exclusion of the clergy from politics, and of prohibition of religious tests for political preferment. The bitterest foes of liberalism were the Presbyterian clergy: "The story of Kentucky Presbyterianism is the story of the ruthless destruction of every vestige of independent theological thought which might arise among the clergy, and even among the laity" (p. 18). As an important step in their war on liberalism the Presbyterian clergy attempted to gain control of education which for all practical purposes meant control of Transylvania University. *Liberal Kentucky* is concerned almost entirely with this struggle over the University. The liberals scored their greatest success in 1817 with the election of Horace Holley to the presidency. But the Presbyterians directed against Holley such a fusillade of vituperation as finally to turn the legislature against him and to force his resignation in 1827. The date marks the end of liberalism in Kentucky. It had perished because the people had been converted to orthodoxy by the Baptists and Methodists and would no longer support freethinkers.

Admitting that the author has made the best of his sources, the reviewer finishes the book somewhat skeptical about the reality of the struggle here depicted. The only liberalism essayed in the book is theological, and even in that limited field the discussion is narrowed to the affairs of the University. The treatment is not broad enough to justify the title of the book. It is as if one should attempt to describe the composition of the solar system by observing a soil sample from Harlan County. Much of what Mr. Sonne has pictured as a theological contest might very properly be viewed merely as political. The Presbyterians were Federalists, the liberals were Republicans, and in those days, as well as in later times, political foes were not above hitting each other with theological clubs. That the Kentucky populace was ever freethinking the reviewer doubts, although he has no doubts at all about its immorality. A conversion to orthodoxy certainly occurred but it was a conversion from immorality, not from infidelity. Freethinking had no more popular support in 1780 than in 1830. But may it not be that the real reason the Kentuckians turned to the Presbyterians was not because the Presbyterians represented orthodoxy, but because they represented wealth and respectability?

Florida State College for Women

R. S. COTTERILL

Alabama: A Social and Economic History of the State. By Marie Bankhead Owen. (Montgomery, Alabama: Dixie Book Company, Inc., 1938. Pp. xvi, 624. Illustrations, maps, appendix. \$3.00.)

At first glance this is just another history of Alabama. Actually it is more than the ordinary history of the state. Its fourteen chapters, comprising biographies of many whose names were connected with Alabama, portray every aspect of the state's development in war and peace, including the native Indians; the explorations of the Spaniards; the coming of the white settlers; transportation; agricultural, commercial, and industrial life; education; religion; literature; and government.

The work is topical rather than chronological. It is comprehensive, instructive, newsy, interesting, and is couched in facile language. In addition to the author's personal familiarity with every phase of her subject, the Department of Archives and History, of which Mrs. Owen is director, supplies rich stores of information on all phases of the commonwealth.

Almost half the book is devoted to a detailed history of Alabama counties. The numerous maps, pictures, and marginal notes add greatly to the value of the text, which obviously was prepared for use in the state's educational system.

Mercer University

JOHN B. CLARK

Admitting that the author has made the best of his sources, the reviewer finishes the book somewhat skeptical about the reality of the struggle here depicted. The only liberalism essayed in the book is theological, and even in that limited field the discussion is narrowed to the affairs of the University. The treatment is not broad enough to justify the title of the book. It is as if one should attempt to describe the composition of the solar system by observing a soil sample from Harlan County. Much of what Mr. Sonne has pictured as a theological contest might very properly be viewed merely as political. The Presbyterians were Federalists, the liberals were Republicans, and in those days, as well as in later times, political foes were not above hitting each other with theological clubs. That the Kentucky populace was ever freethinking the reviewer doubts, although he has no doubts at all about its immorality. A conversion to orthodoxy certainly occurred but it was a conversion from immorality, not from infidelity. Freethinking had no more popular support in 1780 than in 1830. But may it not be that the real reason the Kentuckians turned to the Presbyterians was not because the Presbyterians represented orthodoxy, but because they represented wealth and respectability?

Florida State College for Women

R. S. COTTERILL

Alabama: A Social and Economic History of the State. By Marie Bankhead Owen. (Montgomery, Alabama: Dixie Book Company, Inc., 1938. Pp. xvi, 624. Illustrations, maps, appendix. \$3.00.)

At first glance this is just another history of Alabama. Actually it is more than the ordinary history of the state. Its fourteen chapters, comprising biographies of many whose names were connected with Alabama, portray every aspect of the state's development in war and peace, including the native Indians; the explorations of the Spaniards; the coming of the white settlers; transportation; agricultural, commercial, and industrial life; education; religion; literature; and government.

The work is topical rather than chronological. It is comprehensive, instructive, newsy, interesting, and is couched in facile language. In addition to the author's personal familiarity with every phase of her subject, the Department of Archives and History, of which Mrs. Owen is director, supplies rich stores of information on all phases of the commonwealth.

Almost half the book is devoted to a detailed history of Alabama counties. The numerous maps, pictures, and marginal notes add greatly to the value of the text, which obviously was prepared for use in the state's educational system.

Mercer University

JOHN B. CLARK

Internal Improvement in South Carolina, 1817-1828 . . . from the Reports of the Superintendent of Public Works, and from Contemporary Pamphlets, Newspaper Clippings, Letters, Petitions and Maps. Edited by David Kohn and Bess Glenn. (Washington, D. C.: Privately printed, 1938. Pp. xv, A22, 633. Illustrations, maps, charts, index. \$40.00.)

South Carolina spent over \$2,000,000 for internal improvements between 1818 and 1828. Mr. Kohn has collected and reproduced in this volume reports of the officers in charge of public works. Only the Santee-Cooper Canal had been built in South Carolina before 1817, when the office of Civil and Military Engineer was created. The report of 1818 by John Wilson, engineer, deals with the construction of District Court buildings and goals, obstructions to rivers, canals lateral to the coast, and the need of stock companies to build and maintain better roads. In 1818, \$1,000,000 was appropriated to cover expenditures for four years, and the Engineer's report of 1819, the reports of his successors, the Board of Public Works for 1820-1822, and the Superintendent of Public Works for 1823-1828, continue the story. The Board consisted of Joel R. Poinsett, Robert Mills, Nicholas Harbement, Robert G. Mills, and the Superintendent Abram Blanding who had been Acting Commissioner for the Board. Important to the historian are various recommendations which reveal social and economic conditions. The economist may be interested in accounts itemizing expenditures of construction, while the geographer will find much about the original condition of the state and will be tantalized by references to maps and plans not published, but perhaps still in the state archives.

By 1828 the public building program was completed, canals had been built lateral to the coast and around the falls of the rivers, and a state road from Charleston to Columbia to the Saluda Gap and roads to Camden and Hamburg were ready for use. With the report of 1828 summarizing this work, there is a brief report on a proposed railroad from Charleston to Hamburg, for South Carolina had turned to the newest mode of travel, making her recent constructions obsolete.

Mr. Kohn has also included in his book an anonymous pamphlet, *Plans and Progress of Internal Improvement in South Carolina* (1820), and a curious one by Robert Mills, America's first native architect, *Internal Improvements of South Carolina . . .* (1822). The original pamphlets were annotated with illuminating marginal notes and clippings. Other illustrative materials include excerpts of maps from Mills' *Atlas*; a title page, and a title page and excerpts, from other pamphlets by Mills; letters, notes, brief biographies of the various men, and portraits. In addition, Miss Glenn has prepared an index which is invaluable. It includes place names and certain large subjects as "slaves" and "roads," subdivided by place or other subjects.

In reproducing these pamphlets by an offset photographic process, Mr. Kohn has produced a book important not only to the scholar but to those interested

in photographic publications. He eliminates foxing and staining by filters; illegible material is touched with India ink; and the blots which obscure type are painted out with white ink. The result is very satisfactory, and may be compared with ordinary reproduction as illustrated by two letters which he reproduces from other books. The photographic end pages and also the maps reproduced from Robert Mills' *Atlas* are not sharp enough. The scales of the originals are not indicated and the citations are incorrect as in no case did Mills make a map for more than one district. The book was continuously paged for indexing, but unfortunately the original page numbers were removed so that the originals cannot be compared or citations checked. The book is printed on laid paper, and is watermarked "Aurelian" on every sixth page, so that with the printed marginal notes and continuous paging the facsimile can be distinguished from the original.

It might be argued that \$40 for the volume is disproportionately large, but the originals are very rare, and it should also be considered that the cheapest photographic prints available to the scholar through the Library of Congress or Bibliofilm Service would cost ten cents a page, or \$63 for the volume. So far as can be ascertained Mr. Kohn possesses the only complete set. A portion of the 1825 report and three copies of the Mills pamphlet are in the Library of Congress. The reports of 1818, 1820, and 1825 and two copies of the Mills pamphlet have been located by the American Imprints Inventory, while only one of the Mills items reproduced by title page is listed in the Union Catalogue. In making this material available and indexing it Mr. Kohn and Miss Glenn have performed a true service to scholarship and fine book production.

The National Archives

DAVID C. DUNIWAY

The Presidential Election of 1824 in North Carolina. By Albert Ray Newsome. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1939. Pp. vi, 202. Bibliography, maps. \$1.25.)

In the presidential election of 1824 North Carolina departed from the customs of previous years. In preceding elections the state's complement of presidential electors had been nominated by caucus of the legislature and elected by the people who had no choice other than to vote for the caucus ticket or stay away from the polls. Realizing their unimportance, less than 5,000 North Carolinians cast ballots in the presidential election of 1820. The electors chosen in this fashion then voted for the presidential nominee of the Congressional caucus. The people, except when they elected legislators and congressmen with a view to their participation in the caucuses, had no power under this system. But the overthrow of the system was within their power; and this they accomplished in 1824.

Crawford, the caucus candidate, was placed before North Carolinians as an advocate of governmental economy and peace and as an opponent of tariff and

in photographic publications. He eliminates foxing and staining by filters; illegible material is touched with India ink; and the blots which obscure type are painted out with white ink. The result is very satisfactory, and may be compared with ordinary reproduction as illustrated by two letters which he reproduces from other books. The photographic end pages and also the maps reproduced from Robert Mills' *Atlas* are not sharp enough. The scales of the originals are not indicated and the citations are incorrect as in no case did Mills make a map for more than one district. The book was continuously paged for indexing, but unfortunately the original page numbers were removed so that the originals cannot be compared or citations checked. The book is printed on laid paper, and is watermarked "Aurelian" on every sixth page, so that with the printed marginal notes and continuous paging the facsimile can be distinguished from the original.

It might be argued that \$40 for the volume is disproportionately large, but the originals are very rare, and it should also be considered that the cheapest photographic prints available to the scholar through the Library of Congress or Bibliofilm Service would cost ten cents a page, or \$63 for the volume. So far as can be ascertained Mr. Kohn possesses the only complete set. A portion of the 1825 report and three copies of the Mills pamphlet are in the Library of Congress. The reports of 1818, 1820, and 1825 and two copies of the Mills pamphlet have been located by the American Imprints Inventory, while only one of the Mills items reproduced by title page is listed in the Union Catalogue. In making this material available and indexing it Mr. Kohn and Miss Glenn have performed a true service to scholarship and fine book production.

The National Archives

DAVID C. DUNIWAY

The Presidential Election of 1824 in North Carolina. By Albert Ray Newsome. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1939. Pp. vi, 202. Bibliography, maps. \$1.25.)

In the presidential election of 1824 North Carolina departed from the customs of previous years. In preceding elections the state's complement of presidential electors had been nominated by caucus of the legislature and elected by the people who had no choice other than to vote for the caucus ticket or stay away from the polls. Realizing their unimportance, less than 5,000 North Carolinians cast ballots in the presidential election of 1820. The electors chosen in this fashion then voted for the presidential nominee of the Congressional caucus. The people, except when they elected legislators and congressmen with a view to their participation in the caucuses, had no power under this system. But the overthrow of the system was within their power; and this they accomplished in 1824.

Crawford, the caucus candidate, was placed before North Carolinians as an advocate of governmental economy and peace and as an opponent of tariff and

internal improvements. Inasmuch as state sentiment was divided on these and other national issues, there was some dissatisfaction with his candidacy. Furthermore, since Crawford's friends were the eastern politicians who were in control of the state government, all who disliked the *status quo* in state policies tended to oppose him. Opposition was strongest in the west, and at Salisbury a movement was begun to push the candidacy of Calhoun who was viewed as the champion of nationalism and internal improvements. After an unsuccessful attempt in the state elections of 1823 to fill the legislature with anti-Crawford men, Calhoun's friends formed an anticaucus electoral ticket, using the name People's Ticket with the hope of winning the supporters of Adams and Jackson. Clay had no strength in North Carolina. But when the leaders began to stir up the people in behalf of this ticket, it was soon evident that Jackson rather than Calhoun was the popular favorite. Before election day the People's Ticket, without change of name, had become the Jackson ticket with Calhoun retained in second place. It won more than 20,000 popular votes; the Crawford ticket received about 15,000. Western North Carolina had showed its strength, the popularity of Jackson was proved, the caucus was discredited, and North Carolina had dared to vote contrary to Virginia's behest.

It is not easy in a brief review to indicate the value of this study. It consists chiefly in being an excellent account of a complex and significant episode in North Carolina history. Much information is presented about current methods of political struggle. The fact is well established that although personalities were important forces in the election, issues both state and national played a large part in determining the results. More precision in defining certain geographical terms, such as "sound region," "Quaker counties," and "middle east," would have been helpful. The index is unusually good.

Duke University

CHARLES S. SYDNOR

Democracy in the Making: The Jackson-Tyler Era. By Hugh Russell Fraser. (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1938. Pp. 334. Illustrations, bibliography. \$3.50.)

Interpreting the period as one in which democracy came into its own, Mr. Fraser has written a dramatic story of the years from 1830 to 1844. The author is not concerned with political democracy as manifested in the extension of suffrage, the equalization of representation, and the expanding participation of the people in government. He mentions these things only incidentally. Neither is he concerned with the expanding functions of government. He is primarily interested in the contest between the money power and the national government. The central theme of this gripping story is, therefore, the fight between Andrew Jackson and the Second Bank of the United States. Mr. Fraser adds a new chapter to this story and terminates his account with John Tyler's victory over Henry Clay and the Whigs. Tyler's vetoes of the distribution and Bank bills are

internal improvements. Inasmuch as state sentiment was divided on these and other national issues, there was some dissatisfaction with his candidacy. Furthermore, since Crawford's friends were the eastern politicians who were in control of the state government, all who disliked the *status quo* in state policies tended to oppose him. Opposition was strongest in the west, and at Salisbury a movement was begun to push the candidacy of Calhoun who was viewed as the champion of nationalism and internal improvements. After an unsuccessful attempt in the state elections of 1823 to fill the legislature with anti-Crawford men, Calhoun's friends formed an anticaucus electoral ticket, using the name People's Ticket with the hope of winning the supporters of Adams and Jackson. Clay had no strength in North Carolina. But when the leaders began to stir up the people in behalf of this ticket, it was soon evident that Jackson rather than Calhoun was the popular favorite. Before election day the People's Ticket, without change of name, had become the Jackson ticket with Calhoun retained in second place. It won more than 20,000 popular votes; the Crawford ticket received about 15,000. Western North Carolina had showed its strength, the popularity of Jackson was proved, the caucus was discredited, and North Carolina had dared to vote contrary to Virginia's behest.

It is not easy in a brief review to indicate the value of this study. It consists chiefly in being an excellent account of a complex and significant episode in North Carolina history. Much information is presented about current methods of political struggle. The fact is well established that although personalities were important forces in the election, issues both state and national played a large part in determining the results. More precision in defining certain geographical terms, such as "sound region," "Quaker counties," and "middle east," would have been helpful. The index is unusually good.

Duke University

CHARLES S. SYDNOR

Democracy in the Making: The Jackson-Tyler Era. By Hugh Russell Fraser. (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1938. Pp. 334. Illustrations, bibliography. \$3.50.)

Interpreting the period as one in which democracy came into its own, Mr. Fraser has written a dramatic story of the years from 1830 to 1844. The author is not concerned with political democracy as manifested in the extension of suffrage, the equalization of representation, and the expanding participation of the people in government. He mentions these things only incidentally. Neither is he concerned with the expanding functions of government. He is primarily interested in the contest between the money power and the national government. The central theme of this gripping story is, therefore, the fight between Andrew Jackson and the Second Bank of the United States. Mr. Fraser adds a new chapter to this story and terminates his account with John Tyler's victory over Henry Clay and the Whigs. Tyler's vetoes of the distribution and Bank bills are

regarded as the culmination of the fight begun by Jackson in 1832. Land speculation and the panic of 1837, both of which Mr. Fraser attributes to the evil machinations of the moneyed plutocracy, are treated as parts of the Bank controversy.

Personalities stand out most forcefully in this racy story. Andrew Jackson is of course the chief hero. "For eight long years he had fought monopoly and special privilege. He had sought governmental subsidies for the many, not the few—for the people, not the bankers; for the settlers, not the speculators" (p. 74). Next to Jackson, John Tyler emerges as an able and courageous champion of the people against the corrupt money crowd. The author follows pretty generally the well-traveled road, but his treatment of Tyler is fresh and original. Because Tyler blocked Clay's program of distribution, protection, and the Bank, he was read out of the party by the Whig leaders. Taking his cue from John Quincy Adams, John Minor Botts preferred, in the House of Representatives, "charges of corruption, high crimes and misdemeanors" against Tyler. The House refused to sustain the charges but historians have been prone to accept the view of the Whig leaders and to condemn Tyler for his break with the Whigs. Fraser rescues Tyler from this fate and not only gives him a clean bill of health but adds also a halo of glory for his vigorous championship of the rights of the people. Roger B. Taney is characterized as one of the mightiest foes of special privilege ever to sit on the Supreme Court as chief justice. And Jackson's new appointments to the bench are considered to have brought democracy to the Supreme Court.

Mr. Fraser writes as an intense partisan. Robert J. Walker, a land speculator who sold out to the Bank and accepted retainer fees from the wealthiest planters of Mississippi, is praised as a champion of democracy since he joined forces with Jackson in the Bank fight. On the other hand, George Poindexter is condemned as "the bankrupt Judas" because he opposed Jackson. Journalists and members of Congress who supported the Bank are roundly scored and the sincerity of their motives is always questioned. Even the evils of Jackson's "Pet Banks," clothed with "a power no banking group should have," are attributed not to Jackson's administration but to the sinister influence of the opposition. This partisanship mars an otherwise brilliant interpretation of the Jacksonian period.

University of North Carolina

FLETCHER M. GREEN

The Rampaging Frontier: Manners and Humors of Pioneer Days in the South and the Middle West. By Thomas D. Clark. (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1939. Pp. 350. Bibliography. \$3.00.)

In recent years the dignified brethren of the historical profession have reluctantly admitted that the homely, everyday experiences of men are worth recording. Certainly wit and humor are a part of every people's life, and in even the

regarded as the culmination of the fight begun by Jackson in 1832. Land speculation and the panic of 1837, both of which Mr. Fraser attributes to the evil machinations of the moneyed plutocracy, are treated as parts of the Bank controversy.

Personalities stand out most forcefully in this racy story. Andrew Jackson is of course the chief hero. "For eight long years he had fought monopoly and special privilege. He had sought governmental subsidies for the many, not the few—for the people, not the bankers; for the settlers, not the speculators" (p. 74). Next to Jackson, John Tyler emerges as an able and courageous champion of the people against the corrupt money crowd. The author follows pretty generally the well-traveled road, but his treatment of Tyler is fresh and original. Because Tyler blocked Clay's program of distribution, protection, and the Bank, he was read out of the party by the Whig leaders. Taking his cue from John Quincy Adams, John Minor Botts preferred, in the House of Representatives, "charges of corruption, high crimes and misdemeanors" against Tyler. The House refused to sustain the charges but historians have been prone to accept the view of the Whig leaders and to condemn Tyler for his break with the Whigs. Fraser rescues Tyler from this fate and not only gives him a clean bill of health but adds also a halo of glory for his vigorous championship of the rights of the people. Roger B. Taney is characterized as one of the mightiest foes of special privilege ever to sit on the Supreme Court as chief justice. And Jackson's new appointments to the bench are considered to have brought democracy to the Supreme Court.

Mr. Fraser writes as an intense partisan. Robert J. Walker, a land speculator who sold out to the Bank and accepted retainer fees from the wealthiest planters of Mississippi, is praised as a champion of democracy since he joined forces with Jackson in the Bank fight. On the other hand, George Poindexter is condemned as "the bankrupt Judas" because he opposed Jackson. Journalists and members of Congress who supported the Bank are roundly scored and the sincerity of their motives is always questioned. Even the evils of Jackson's "Pet Banks," clothed with "a power no banking group should have," are attributed not to Jackson's administration but to the sinister influence of the opposition. This partisanship mars an otherwise brilliant interpretation of the Jacksonian period.

University of North Carolina

FLETCHER M. GREEN

The Rampaging Frontier: Manners and Humors of Pioneer Days in the South and the Middle West. By Thomas D. Clark. (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1939. Pp. 350. Bibliography. \$3.00.)

In recent years the dignified brethren of the historical profession have reluctantly admitted that the homely, everyday experiences of men are worth recording. Certainly wit and humor are a part of every people's life, and in even the

most tragic chapters of human history Nature has generally provided some comic relief. Recent books, like Constance Rourke's *American Humor*, Hudson's *Humor of the Old Deep South*, and Blair's *Native American Humor, 1800-1900*, are serious, scholarly contributions, to prove that some of history has been lived "in lighter vein." Professor Clark has now added his *Rampaging Frontier* to this distinguished list, and in scholarship, style, and appreciation for his materials, Clark's book is the equal, and in some respects, the superior of the books with which it is likely to be compared.

The Rampaging Frontier is a bit of impressionism, dealing with the manners and humors of pioneer days in the Middle West. It is concerned with the "earthy elements of humanity." Its locale is the frontier west of the Alleghenies, between the boundaries of Tennessee and the Ohio River, and extending to the Mississippi, with an occasional excursion beyond. The period is the seventy-five years before 1850. Clark gives us an exciting picture of that old frontier, with its brawls and "gougings" and its barbarous gander pullings; its tobacco-spitting pioneers; the "varmints" of the forests; the river men, gamblers, politicians, judges, and preachers; the steamboat traffic, the taverns, the liquor barrels, the political barbecues, the camp meetings, and the pulpit orators who preached a wrathful God; the horse racing and cockfighting; the fiddlers and the "gals"; the greenhorns and the Yankee peddlers; and dozens of other types and incidents associated with an earlier and picturesque America. The author has caught the spirit of it all so well that he seems to write almost as an eyewitness of the scenes he describes.

Some of this material will not please the fastidious, and is not intended for readers with weak stomachs. Perhaps some lines in the picture have been drawn a little too sharply to preserve the exact perspective. But no reader will fail to find the book interesting, and he will long remember many of the tall tales reproduced. Whoever can read the description of the fight with the tiger, or the account of the buckskin patriot who wanted to repeal the common law, or the judge's reference to the man "who would ride a jackass into the Garden of Eden and hitch him to the Tree of Life," without bursting into a loud guffaw, needs to be psychoanalyzed.

The book is entertaining and amusing on almost every page, but this should not blind the reader to the fact that it is a serious piece of historical craftsmanship, and a real contribution to American history and American humor. Its many pages of bibliography and footnotes reflect years of research into all kinds of elusive historical materials. To master the idiom of the frontier, or to learn the intricacies of cards and gambling in order to write the chapter on "Keards," in itself requires long and careful application to a subject which the reviewer assumes was not part of the original intellectual endowment of the author.

Lee, Grant and Sherman: A Study in Leadership in the 1864-65 Campaign.

By Lieut.- Colonel Alfred H. Burne. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1939. Pp. xxiii, 216. Frontispiece, tables, maps. \$3.00.)

In the years since the close of the Civil War, many of the developments then presaged or first devised have been improved and refined by study and use until now the combat army has become a collection of machines manned by humans, rather than a collection of humans using such crude machines as were then available. The muzzle-loading smoothbore has given way to the high-powered automatic rifle; the little-used Gatling gun has been developed into the machine gun; the cumbersome, short-range, cast-iron cannons have been replaced by the long-range, powerful howitzers, mortars, and siege guns; the captive observation balloon is no more but myriads of airplanes have taken over its functions and immensely enlarged them; the slow-moving horse- and mule-drawn munitions and supply trains have been replaced by the swift motor truck or ammunition lorry; the crude, temporary trench system has given way to the elaborate, permanent trench fortification.

In spite of these vast and far-reaching changes in the weapons and methods of warfare, the human element has changed hardly at all; the principles of warfare, likewise, have changed little. The ability effectively to co-ordinate speed, mobility, surprise movement, and fire power are still the essential components of successful military leadership. It is for this reason that a careful study of the strategy, tactics, and leadership of Lee, Grant, and Sherman is useful. Each of these leaders, with varying success, employed these principles. A study of their performance such as here presented is therefore worth-while.

The author's principal interest is in Lee's skillful leadership; Grant is admired primarily for his "tenacity of purpose" in the problem of forcing Lee back to Richmond; Sherman is criticized for his constant pursuit of geographical rather than military objectives, as witness his failure to destroy Hood's army after the fall of Atlanta and his subsequent raids to the sea and thence northward through the Carolinas.

The author also devotes space to the near successes of Early in the Shenandoah Valley and Hood in Tennessee. The two campaigns, seldom considered in critical military studies of the last year of the war, deserve more than passing notice. Though essentially auxiliary operations, final Confederate success in either would have had far-reaching results; as it was they only lacked force and more driving power to achieve their objectives. Early, by "his own boldness, activity, quick wittedness, driving power and willingness to take risks," came so near to success that Grant was forced to make heavy detachments of reinforcements to check him. Sheridan, assigned to dispose of Early, is considered "a failure" as "an independent army commander." With reasonably equal resources in men and materials Early conceivably could have driven Sheridan

across the Potomac and himself taken the offensive. But already the sun of the Confederacy was sinking.

The same handicaps that restricted the extent of Early's success also affected Hood, whom the author considers the "most maligned" of Southern generals, although for what reasons is not apparent. Hood's service under Johnston and his accession to command the Army of Tennessee in Johnston's place reflect little credit on him. The author's discussion of Hood's elevation to the command of the army is both misleading and inaccurate, and betrays a lack of detailed knowledge of the incident (pp. 72, 73, 89, 96). Hood was an energetic and daring leader in the midst of battle, but less successful in directing an army in the field. The author's defense overlooks the basic reasons for much of the criticism that has been directed against Hood, criticism based on his own conduct and leadership. His strategical conceptions were good, but his tactical execution left much to be desired. Stubbornness, pique, and irresolution at critical moments characterized Hood and he was defeated in every battle after he succeeded Johnston.

Though written in a historical vacuum without reference to social, political, and economic conditions, this book is a welcome addition to the military history of the period. There are, however, an inexcusable number of errors in names, dates, spelling, citations, etc. For a book of this character the footnotes would be more helpful if they were more explicit and informing. There is an introductory preface by Dr. Douglas Southall Freeman, a bibliographical note, an index, and more than twenty-five useful maps.

Port Washington, New York

THOMAS ROBSON HAY

The Man Who Killed Lincoln. By Philip Van Doren Stern. (New York: Random House, 1939. Pp. vii, 376. Frontispiece. \$3.00.)

Here is a book with many marks of excellence in writing, but one so colored for dramatic effect by the flare of the writer's literary brush that it mystifies the reader as to the author's purposes and the value of the book. One sees throughout the narrative a curious mingling of fiction and fact, which the uninformed will not seek to disentangle, but will accept as truth, and whose false impressions will not be corrected easily, if at all.

The author begins with a fantastic story laid on Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington. A picture of Booth is presented—his appearance at the particular time, what he thought, what he said to himself, exactly how he twisted his face, and even the remarks of soldiers to Booth or about him as they passed by—all of it written as if it were factual and historical. The same method is used in reporting an alleged conversation between George Atzerodt and a soldier in a barroom (pp. 148-51). Further on there is an apparently authentic description of the imaginings and words of Booth (pp. 184-86), and an alleged conversa-

across the Potomac and himself taken the offensive. But already the sun of the Confederacy was sinking.

The same handicaps that restricted the extent of Early's success also affected Hood, whom the author considers the "most maligned" of Southern generals, although for what reasons is not apparent. Hood's service under Johnston and his accession to command the Army of Tennessee in Johnston's place reflect little credit on him. The author's discussion of Hood's elevation to the command of the army is both misleading and inaccurate, and betrays a lack of detailed knowledge of the incident (pp. 72, 73, 89, 96). Hood was an energetic and daring leader in the midst of battle, but less successful in directing an army in the field. The author's defense overlooks the basic reasons for much of the criticism that has been directed against Hood, criticism based on his own conduct and leadership. His strategical conceptions were good, but his tactical execution left much to be desired. Stubbornness, pique, and irresolution at critical moments characterized Hood and he was defeated in every battle after he succeeded Johnston.

Though written in a historical vacuum without reference to social, political, and economic conditions, this book is a welcome addition to the military history of the period. There are, however, an inexcusable number of errors in names, dates, spelling, citations, etc. For a book of this character the footnotes would be more helpful if they were more explicit and informing. There is an introductory preface by Dr. Douglas Southall Freeman, a bibliographical note, an index, and more than twenty-five useful maps.

Port Washington, New York

THOMAS ROBSON HAY

The Man Who Killed Lincoln. By Philip Van Doren Stern. (New York: Random House, 1939. Pp. vii, 376. Frontispiece. \$3.00.)

Here is a book with many marks of excellence in writing, but one so colored for dramatic effect by the flare of the writer's literary brush that it mystifies the reader as to the author's purposes and the value of the book. One sees throughout the narrative a curious mingling of fiction and fact, which the uninformed will not seek to disentangle, but will accept as truth, and whose false impressions will not be corrected easily, if at all.

The author begins with a fantastic story laid on Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington. A picture of Booth is presented—his appearance at the particular time, what he thought, what he said to himself, exactly how he twisted his face, and even the remarks of soldiers to Booth or about him as they passed by—all of it written as if it were factual and historical. The same method is used in reporting an alleged conversation between George Atzerodt and a soldier in a barroom (pp. 148-51). Further on there is an apparently authentic description of the imaginings and words of Booth (pp. 184-86), and an alleged conversa-

tion of Samuel Cox and Booth is set down (pp. 203-13). Again, there is much detail of events and words spoken in the barn where the assassin met his fate, all written as if it is a factual presentation.

The defective character of this book is not remedied by the "Pamphlet to accompany *The Man Who Killed Lincoln*," with the title "Afterword," which had better have been called "Afterthought," hidden away in a pocket in the back cover of the book. In this the author discusses sources of material and possible future revelations. Here readers are told that history has provided the stage, with tragic pattern, plot, characters, and setting, all freely given. The author then adds naïvely: "There was no need to invent anything in the telling of the story, other than conversation, internal and external, and that with the few minor exceptions listed below is all that I have invented."

How can the casual reader know what the author invented and what he based on the many reliable sources he consulted in his several years of research? One wonders why readers were not forewarned or informed in an "Introduction" rather than told about the character of the book and its purposes in a detached "Afterword."

As a study of Booth, and as a historical treatise, the reviewer thinks the work is an unfortunate one, for too many will take it for what it certainly is not—an accurate, realistic picture of Booth in those tragic days around Lincoln's assassination. There is a place for historical romance candidly written as romance, but there is no place for romantic history and drama presented as history.

State College, Santa Barbara, California

WILLIAM H. ELLISON

Invisible Empire: The Story of the Ku Klux Klan, 1866-1871. By Stanley F. Horn. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1939. Pp. x, 434. Illustrations, appendix. \$3.50.)

In many respects the same nocturnal mystery that shrouded the Ku Klux Klan in the beginning, hiding its secrets from the public, inquisitive journalists, paid spies, and Congressional committees, lingers on, making the way hard for those who like to delve into the secrets of the past. As a story of the Klan, rather than as a definitive history, the book under review has much to commend it. Beginning with a rather unusual pictorial history which illustrates the Klan from the beginning to the end, the author then discusses its origin and growth, the methods of operation, and gives separate chapters on the different "Realms," or states, included in the Invisible Empire. Because the conditions giving rise to the Klan were a part of Reconstruction, the author gives a rather dark picture of that era. Despite the extensive testimony found in the thirteen-volume Congressional report and the testimony given at the Ku Klux trials, the author has not succeeded in finding when the Klan started or came to an end in all of the Southern states. The leaders in large part remain unknown, and it seems entirely unsafe to generalize on the character of the membership of the

tion of Samuel Cox and Booth is set down (pp. 203-13). Again, there is much detail of events and words spoken in the barn where the assassin met his fate, all written as if it is a factual presentation.

The defective character of this book is not remedied by the "Pamphlet to accompany *The Man Who Killed Lincoln*," with the title "Afterword," which had better have been called "Afterthought," hidden away in a pocket in the back cover of the book. In this the author discusses sources of material and possible future revelations. Here readers are told that history has provided the stage, with tragic pattern, plot, characters, and setting, all freely given. The author then adds naïvely: "There was no need to invent anything in the telling of the story, other than conversation, internal and external, and that with the few minor exceptions listed below is all that I have invented."

How can the casual reader know what the author invented and what he based on the many reliable sources he consulted in his several years of research? One wonders why readers were not forewarned or informed in an "Introduction" rather than told about the character of the book and its purposes in a detached "Afterword."

As a study of Booth, and as a historical treatise, the reviewer thinks the work is an unfortunate one, for too many will take it for what it certainly is not—an accurate, realistic picture of Booth in those tragic days around Lincoln's assassination. There is a place for historical romance candidly written as romance, but there is no place for romantic history and drama presented as history.

State College, Santa Barbara, California

WILLIAM H. ELLISON

Invisible Empire: The Story of the Ku Klux Klan, 1866-1871. By Stanley F. Horn. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1939. Pp. x, 434. Illustrations, appendix. \$3.50.)

In many respects the same nocturnal mystery that shrouded the Ku Klux Klan in the beginning, hiding its secrets from the public, inquisitive journalists, paid spies, and Congressional committees, lingers on, making the way hard for those who like to delve into the secrets of the past. As a story of the Klan, rather than as a definitive history, the book under review has much to commend it. Beginning with a rather unusual pictorial history which illustrates the Klan from the beginning to the end, the author then discusses its origin and growth, the methods of operation, and gives separate chapters on the different "Realms," or states, included in the Invisible Empire. Because the conditions giving rise to the Klan were a part of Reconstruction, the author gives a rather dark picture of that era. Despite the extensive testimony found in the thirteen-volume Congressional report and the testimony given at the Ku Klux trials, the author has not succeeded in finding when the Klan started or came to an end in all of the Southern states. The leaders in large part remain unknown, and it seems entirely unsafe to generalize on the character of the membership of the

local Dens, or on the number of members in any locality. Generally the strength of the organization was in proportion to the evils of the reconstruction in that vicinity. But in Virginia there was no Klan, and in Louisiana and Texas other organizations, such as the Knights of the White Camelia and the Confederate Vigilantes, engaged in somewhat the same activities as the Klan elsewhere, and were frequently confused with it. In all states where the Klan flourished it did so sporadically; in many counties it did not appear at all. Mr. Horn usually attributes the Klan's appearance to the fact that the region concerned was adjacent to the home state of the organization, as in North Alabama, or to a visit by the reputed Grand Wizard, General Forrest.

The necessarily nebulous character of the Klan made it difficult to control, and it was inevitable that it should be perverted by unworthy members, or, as sometimes happened, used by nonmembers and even Negroes in ways which could only further discredit the organization. This situation, together with the opposition from the Radical state governments and the Federal government, and the gradual re-establishment of white supremacy in the South, led to the supposed disbandment of the Klan in 1869; but it was after this date that the association reached its most active stage. It was late in 1871, for example, that Grant established martial law in nine counties of South Carolina because of Klan disturbances. Five chapters are devoted to the decline of the Empire. There is a useful appendix.

While the reviewer is disposed to sympathize with the author in his efforts to trace the elusive Klan, he cannot accept the implication that this is the "complete story." In dealing with a subject that requires the most careful weighing of the evidence, the author is less than critical, and the bibliography is wholly inadequate. There is a pro-Southern and pro-Klan bias which leads to such overstatements as that "Bands of [Union] League members, armed to the teeth, prowled the country at all times." He says that General George W. Gordon wrote the *Prescript* or original constitution of the Klan, but he offers no proof. James W. Patton's *Unionism and Reconstruction in Tennessee* (not in Mr. Horn's bibliography) makes a contrary statement. The author assumes that John B. Gordon was the leader of the Klan in Georgia, and again there is no proof. He is satisfied by the evidence that Nathan Bedford Forrest was the Grand Wizard of the Klan and the moving force behind it. But John A. Wyeth, Forrest's "foremost biographer," did not even consider him a member, and the *Dictionary of American Biography* says of Forrest: "He was involved in the early activities of the Ku Klux Klan, but his connection with the order does not seem to have lasted long." A few minor errors were observed: The name is Mike Strohmeir, not Stroheimer; Robert K. Scott, not Richard K., and Simons, not Simmons. The election referred to on page 215 was held in 1868, not 1867. Luke E. Wright was not secretary of war in Taft's cabinet.

Forty-one years ago the late John Spencer Bassett, contemplating wider fields

for his talents, asked his mentor, Herbert Baxter Adams, how he thought "a clear and comprehensive study of the Ku Klux would strike the public." It is hard to say how it would strike the public, but the serious student of the South would welcome it, despite Mr. Horn's readable narrative.

Duke University

R. H. WOODY

Negro Education in Alabama: A Study in Cotton and Steel. By Horace Mann Bond. (Washington: The Associated Publishers, Inc., 1939. Pp. xii, 358. Illustrations, bibliography. \$3.25.)

The subtitle correctly informs the reader that this study, aided by a Julius Rosenwald fund grant, is sustained by a socio-economic thesis. It is really an interpretation of the roots and bases of the history and present status of Negro education in Alabama. Continuity is necessarily sacrificed a bit in works of this type, but four general divisions are clearly delimited. The first eight chapters, or about one third of the text, deal with slavery and Reconstruction up to 1875 when control passed permanently over to the conservative Democrats. Chapters nine through eleven develop the changing economic structure, 1860-1901, and its effect. The next two dramatize and interpret the result of the constitutional convention of 1901, and the remaining five explain the economic reasons for the progress to date, aided by philanthropy and unusual personalities.

Throughout the work the author, a professor of education at Fisk University, emphasized basic geographic factors, made clear by outline maps used cleverly as a recurring background for economic and educational statistics. He explains the transition to share-cropping and the control by merchants and money markets, and details the part played by rival capitalistic groups in the railroad era, the rise of industrialism and consequent decline of the Black Belt.

To read any work on Southern history since the Civil War which pretends to be more than a chronicle, with the canons of scientific history in mind, is futile and absurd. We are still a part of the process and our histories are also documents. The author shows skill in the use of prejudices as "documentary evidences to a state of mind" (p. 24). The same test could be applied to his criticism of Fleming. The first few chapters consequently assume a negative flavor, though he notes that educational and political reformers "advanced policies in the South with reference to the Negro far ahead of contemporary northern practice." His close synthesis of all factors strengthens his criticisms of some conclusions, but fails to impair the great value of Fleming's work as a whole. Stimulating ideas are bred, such as the suggestion to study the effect of the panic of 1873 on Reconstruction. His study of the struggle between the railroad interests is important but needs further documentation to fortify the conclusion that **another** faction of the new Northern industrialism came to terms with the archaic planting aristocracy, causing the Republican party to collapse (p. 72).

for his talents, asked his mentor, Herbert Baxter Adams, how he thought "a clear and comprehensive study of the Ku Klux would strike the public." It is hard to say how it would strike the public, but the serious student of the South would welcome it, despite Mr. Horn's readable narrative.

Duke University

R. H. WOODY

Negro Education in Alabama: A Study in Cotton and Steel. By Horace Mann Bond. (Washington: The Associated Publishers, Inc., 1939. Pp. xii, 358. Illustrations, bibliography. \$3.25.)

The subtitle correctly informs the reader that this study, aided by a Julius Rosenwald fund grant, is sustained by a socio-economic thesis. It is really an interpretation of the roots and bases of the history and present status of Negro education in Alabama. Continuity is necessarily sacrificed a bit in works of this type, but four general divisions are clearly delimited. The first eight chapters, or about one third of the text, deal with slavery and Reconstruction up to 1875 when control passed permanently over to the conservative Democrats. Chapters nine through eleven develop the changing economic structure, 1860-1901, and its effect. The next two dramatize and interpret the result of the constitutional convention of 1901, and the remaining five explain the economic reasons for the progress to date, aided by philanthropy and unusual personalities.

Throughout the work the author, a professor of education at Fisk University, emphasized basic geographic factors, made clear by outline maps used cleverly as a recurring background for economic and educational statistics. He explains the transition to share-cropping and the control by merchants and money markets, and details the part played by rival capitalistic groups in the railroad era, the rise of industrialism and consequent decline of the Black Belt.

To read any work on Southern history since the Civil War which pretends to be more than a chronicle, with the canons of scientific history in mind, is futile and absurd. We are still a part of the process and our histories are also documents. The author shows skill in the use of prejudices as "documentary evidences to a state of mind" (p. 24). The same test could be applied to his criticism of Fleming. The first few chapters consequently assume a negative flavor, though he notes that educational and political reformers "advanced policies in the South with reference to the Negro far ahead of contemporary northern practice." His close synthesis of all factors strengthens his criticisms of some conclusions, but fails to impair the great value of Fleming's work as a whole. Stimulating ideas are bred, such as the suggestion to study the effect of the panic of 1873 on Reconstruction. His study of the struggle between the railroad interests is important but needs further documentation to fortify the conclusion that another faction of the new Northern industrialism came to terms with the archaic planting aristocracy, causing the Republican party to collapse (p. 72).

Dr. Bond proves the detrimental effect of share-cropping on Negro education; intelligence in business matters and that system do not go together. He also explains how a higher type of education is necessary in an industrial order. The influence of industrialism, migration from the Black Belt, and philanthropy, he concludes, are responsible for the greatly improved conditions since 1910. Historians will probably be most interested in his close analysis of conditions in the Black Belt showing methods of white domination, the Negro's loss of power, and subsequent decline of the area in politics. The study of the use and effects of taxation in maintaining control are illuminating. The work is primarily concerned with public education, but the linkage and influence of the Slater, Jeannes, Rosenwald, and other funds are clearly shown.

No doubt criticism could be made of the discussion of the Populists. Economic determinism is the prevailing note, but it sometimes leads to a slight confusion. The coverage of all types of source material is most unusual. Historians will discover omissions of certain recent works in the bibliography, but the inclusion of others of unusual interest. The notes are inconveniently grouped at the end, unnecessary in a nonpopular work. The author should write another work on the subject matter of Negro education and its effect on the race.

Hayes Memorial Library

CURTIS W. GARRISON

Personal Recollections of Trinity College, North Carolina, 1887-1894. By John Franklin Crowell. (Durham: Duke University Press, 1939. Pp. xiv, 280. Illustrations. \$3.00.)

It is a far cry from struggling, almost moribund, Trinity College in rural Randolph County, North Carolina, in 1887 to its offspring, spacious Duke University in 1939. The story is interesting and the beginning of the transformation is here told by the man who more than any other is responsible. It is an important part of the history of education in the South.

A few months ago Duke University celebrated the centenary of Union Institute out of which Trinity College grew. The driving force behind the struggling college from the time it was adopted by the North Carolina Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church South in 1856, was a self-taught genius, Braxton Craven. With the exception of a few years in the pastorate, he was president until his death in 1882, and can almost be said to have been the college. All had not been clear sailing, however. Funds were scanty and some of the ecclesiastical politicians did not like Dr. Craven. Much of the state at that time was included in other conferences which had institutions of their own.

As so often happens in a one-man institution, there was difficulty in finding a successor upon whom the factions could unite, and the institution seemed about to disintegrate. Three trustees agreed to supplement the small college income so that the six devoted professors could live with the aid of the food they could

Dr. Bond proves the detrimental effect of share-cropping on Negro education; intelligence in business matters and that system do not go together. He also explains how a higher type of education is necessary in an industrial order. The influence of industrialism, migration from the Black Belt, and philanthropy, he concludes, are responsible for the greatly improved conditions since 1910. Historians will probably be most interested in his close analysis of conditions in the Black Belt showing methods of white domination, the Negro's loss of power, and subsequent decline of the area in politics. The study of the use and effects of taxation in maintaining control are illuminating. The work is primarily concerned with public education, but the linkage and influence of the Slater, Jeannes, Rosenwald, and other funds are clearly shown.

No doubt criticism could be made of the discussion of the Populists. Economic determinism is the prevailing note, but it sometimes leads to a slight confusion. The coverage of all types of source material is most unusual. Historians will discover omissions of certain recent works in the bibliography, but the inclusion of others of unusual interest. The notes are inconveniently grouped at the end, unnecessary in a nonpopular work. The author should write another work on the subject matter of Negro education and its effect on the race.

Hayes Memorial Library

CURTIS W. GARRISON

Personal Recollections of Trinity College, North Carolina, 1887-1894. By John Franklin Crowell. (Durham: Duke University Press, 1939. Pp. xiv, 280. Illustrations. \$3.00.)

It is a far cry from struggling, almost moribund, Trinity College in rural Randolph County, North Carolina, in 1887 to its offspring, spacious Duke University in 1939. The story is interesting and the beginning of the transformation is here told by the man who more than any other is responsible. It is an important part of the history of education in the South.

A few months ago Duke University celebrated the centenary of Union Institute out of which Trinity College grew. The driving force behind the struggling college from the time it was adopted by the North Carolina Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church South in 1856, was a self-taught genius, Braxton Craven. With the exception of a few years in the pastorate, he was president until his death in 1882, and can almost be said to have been the college. All had not been clear sailing, however. Funds were scanty and some of the ecclesiastical politicians did not like Dr. Craven. Much of the state at that time was included in other conferences which had institutions of their own.

As so often happens in a one-man institution, there was difficulty in finding a successor upon whom the factions could unite, and the institution seemed about to disintegrate. Three trustees agreed to supplement the small college income so that the six devoted professors could live with the aid of the food they could

raise in their gardens and other pieces of land they cultivated. Meanwhile the trustees sought for a president with discouraging results. The college was small and poor, most Methodists were poor, the state was poor and thought it was poorer than it really was.

The answer was to come from an unexpected quarter. Two students in the Yale Divinity School became friends, and often talked of education and particularly of education in the South. One, John Franklin Crowell, a Pennsylvanian by birth and a graduate of Yale, was also interested in economics and sociology. The other, H. H. Williams, a graduate of the University of North Carolina, and later professor of philosophy in his alma mater, had taught Greek at Trinity for a year. He decided that Crowell might be the man, and when in North Carolina communicated his idea to the committee of the trustees.

After considerable correspondence the young man of twenty-nine, then principal of an academy in Pennsylvania, was chosen president and took office in 1887. His energy was boundless, and he began to stimulate both faculty and students. He taught courses in the social sciences, the first in the state, and encouraged students to look at the world outside. The revolutionary idea that a college should be a vital part of a commonwealth, and that the faculty inside the classroom or out should have the right to discuss any public question was advanced. The curriculum was revised, new members were added to the faculty, and intercollegiate football was introduced. All of these innovations caused some stir.

The young man was something of a visionary—though he thought he always had his feet upon the ground—and began to plan an institution almost as extensive as the modern Duke, thirty-five years before the Duke Foundation. In addition a group of preparatory schools and another of junior colleges were to be affiliated. Apparently he never realized the immense cost, and had no clear idea of the source of the necessary funds. He carried the students with him, but dissensions in the faculty arose. Perhaps the young president was not so tactful as he might have been.

With these plans came the necessity of removing the college from its rural environment to a larger town. This idea created a storm. The residents of the village, several of the faculty, many of the Methodist ministers, some of the trustees, and perhaps a majority of the alumni were opposed at first. After much discussion removal was voted provided that equal or greater facilities be offered by some one of the larger towns, then just beginning to grow into cities. Though the way had been prepared for him, he was largely responsible for the offer by General Julian S. Carr of a site in Durham, and of \$85,000 in cash by Washington Duke. The offers were accepted and building was soon begun. President Crowell himself gave the building for the future School of Technology.

Misfortunes followed. The tower of the almost finished main building collapsed, delaying removal for a year; costs outran estimates; some of the build-

ings were badly planned and there was considerable discomfort. Expenses had increased and income had not increased proportionately. Salaries could not be paid promptly though the President poured his personal funds into the treasury. The Duke family was not yet ready to make further considerable contributions.

Dissension in the faculty grew stronger, and there was covert opposition among the trustees. Finally, in 1893, The Western North Carolina Conference, joint owner of the institution, condemned intercollegiate athletics, although President Crowell had indicated that he would look upon such action as a lack of confidence in his administration. The Conference had always been lukewarm toward Trinity, and the athletic question was possibly only an excuse. The reviewer, however, was living in North Carolina then, and well remembers how excited many Methodists became over the question. The action of the Conference, together with other disappointments led President Crowell to offer his resignation in May, 1894, although the trustees unanimously asked him to remain. He refused and left the state after seven years of arduous toil.

Most of these things are set forth in the book. While there is little specific criticism of others, apparently he never blamed himself for any of his difficulties. It is probably true that greater tact in dealing with the older members of the faculty and trustees would have prevented some of the ill-feeling. Other honest men were unable to follow his ideas and believed that the institution would be wrecked by plans which seemed hopelessly extravagant.

Nothing can take from him the honor of being the pioneer in the rebirth of higher education in North Carolina. The present generation, seeing two nationally recognized universities and several strong colleges in the state, can with difficulty visualize the state of higher education in 1887 when the institutions lacked equipment, libraries, funds, students, and the consciousness of their possibilities. He remade Trinity, and stimulated every other institution in the state.

The College of the City of New York

HOLLAND THOMPSON

Child Labor Legislation in the Southern Textile States. By Elizabeth H. Davidson. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1939. Pp. x, 302. Map, tables, bibliography. \$4.00.)

This is a work of permanent value, done with model competence and thoroughness. Represented modestly as a history of child labor legislation from the eighties to the present, chiefly in Alabama, Georgia, and the Carolinas, the book becomes a study of the social consciousness of a region in the throes of industrial revolution.

Much of Miss Davidson's success is due to the pains she has taken, while unearthing hundreds of bills, resolutions, committee reports, to preserve along with each specimen its taproot and tendrils of folkways, mores, and taboos. She then displays them in their native soil of sectional peculiarities, against a back-

ings were badly planned and there was considerable discomfort. Expenses had increased and income had not increased proportionately. Salaries could not be paid promptly though the President poured his personal funds into the treasury. The Duke family was not yet ready to make further considerable contributions.

Dissension in the faculty grew stronger, and there was covert opposition among the trustees. Finally, in 1893, The Western North Carolina Conference, joint owner of the institution, condemned intercollegiate athletics, although President Crowell had indicated that he would look upon such action as a lack of confidence in his administration. The Conference had always been lukewarm toward Trinity, and the athletic question was possibly only an excuse. The reviewer, however, was living in North Carolina then, and well remembers how excited many Methodists became over the question. The action of the Conference, together with other disappointments led President Crowell to offer his resignation in May, 1894, although the trustees unanimously asked him to remain. He refused and left the state after seven years of arduous toil.

Most of these things are set forth in the book. While there is little specific criticism of others, apparently he never blamed himself for any of his difficulties. It is probably true that greater tact in dealing with the older members of the faculty and trustees would have prevented some of the ill-feeling. Other honest men were unable to follow his ideas and believed that the institution would be wrecked by plans which seemed hopelessly extravagant.

Nothing can take from him the honor of being the pioneer in the rebirth of higher education in North Carolina. The present generation, seeing two nationally recognized universities and several strong colleges in the state, can with difficulty visualize the state of higher education in 1887 when the institutions lacked equipment, libraries, funds, students, and the consciousness of their possibilities. He remade Trinity, and stimulated every other institution in the state.

The College of the City of New York

HOLLAND THOMPSON

Child Labor Legislation in the Southern Textile States. By Elizabeth H. Davidson. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1939. Pp. x, 302. Map, tables, bibliography. \$4.00.)

This is a work of permanent value, done with model competence and thoroughness. Represented modestly as a history of child labor legislation from the eighties to the present, chiefly in Alabama, Georgia, and the Carolinas, the book becomes a study of the social consciousness of a region in the throes of industrial revolution.

Much of Miss Davidson's success is due to the pains she has taken, while unearthing hundreds of bills, resolutions, committee reports, to preserve along with each specimen its taproot and tendrils of folkways, mores, and taboos. She then displays them in their native soil of sectional peculiarities, against a back-

ground of historical heritage, class conflict, and race difference. Important in her study are factors too often ignored in the ordinary chronicle of legislative history. They include the powerful heritage of paternalism left by plantation slavery, the persistence of the code of family mores and parental authority of feudal strictness, a buccaneer individualism run amuck in the machine age, a sectional defense reflex automatically called into play by any outside criticism.

The central theme of the study is the gradual relaxation of the grip of the laissez-faire creed upon the Southern mind. Anyone who studies this period of Southern history will be impressed by the desperation with which the South grasped at industrialization (especially in textiles) as a panacea. In the depths of their poverty, Southerners fixed upon the cotton mill as a symbol of salvation, and it became almost an emotional necessity among all classes to believe in the panacea. Any threat against it was heresy. This attitude was complicated by the battle for textile supremacy begun against New England about 1880 and won by 1910. Social legislation was easily made to appear another "Yankee trick" to undermine "Southern progress." Baffled by conflicting argument voters listened respectfully to the industrialists, men convinced that they were "the best people of the state—the people who had solved the Negro problem, and who could handle the labor problem as well." Ignorance and poverty and greed contributed to the reformer's problem complications not without their ironies. In one petition of millworkers against a ten-hour-day bill, 154 signers had to make their marks. One industrialist famous for his educational endowments, proclaimed that "The most beautiful sight we see is the child at labor; as early as he may get at labor the more beautiful." The paternalistic industrialist was likely to represent his mill "as an orphan asylum, a children's training school, a playground."

Other readers may share with the reviewer a disappointment in finding scant reference to actual conditions of child labor to accompany the story of legislative reform. A few errors of fact were inevitable: Hoke Smith can hardly be called "an ardent silver Democrat" (p. 85), and Ellison A. Smyth, the South Carolina industrialist, is confused with Ellison D. Smith, the cotton Senator (*passim*). This reviewer, however, only wishes that the same competent hands may continue the history of Southern social legislation admirably launched in this book.

University of Florida

C. VANN WOODWARD

Carter Glass: Unreconstructed Rebel. By James E. Palmer. (Roanoke, Virginia: The Institute of American Biography, 1938. Pp. 320. Illustrations, bibliography. \$3.25.)

The career of a man like Carter Glass is seldom if ever equaled in American history, and many will be the biographies and studies connected with his life. This first published biography presents an interesting account of the small-town

ground of historical heritage, class conflict, and race difference. Important in her study are factors too often ignored in the ordinary chronicle of legislative history. They include the powerful heritage of paternalism left by plantation slavery, the persistence of the code of family mores and parental authority of feudal strictness, a buccaneer individualism run amuck in the machine age, a sectional defense reflex automatically called into play by any outside criticism.

The central theme of the study is the gradual relaxation of the grip of the laissez-faire creed upon the Southern mind. Anyone who studies this period of Southern history will be impressed by the desperation with which the South grasped at industrialization (especially in textiles) as a panacea. In the depths of their poverty, Southerners fixed upon the cotton mill as a symbol of salvation, and it became almost an emotional necessity among all classes to believe in the panacea. Any threat against it was heresy. This attitude was complicated by the battle for textile supremacy begun against New England about 1880 and won by 1910. Social legislation was easily made to appear another "Yankee trick" to undermine "Southern progress." Baffled by conflicting argument voters listened respectfully to the industrialists, men convinced that they were "the best people of the state—the people who had solved the Negro problem, and who could handle the labor problem as well." Ignorance and poverty and greed contributed to the reformer's problem complications not without their ironies. In one petition of millworkers against a ten-hour-day bill, 154 signers had to make their marks. One industrialist famous for his educational endowments, proclaimed that "The most beautiful sight we see is the child at labor; as early as he may get at labor the more beautiful." The paternalistic industrialist was likely to represent his mill "as an orphan asylum, a children's training school, a playground."

Other readers may share with the reviewer a disappointment in finding scant reference to actual conditions of child labor to accompany the story of legislative reform. A few errors of fact were inevitable: Hoke Smith can hardly be called "an ardent silver Democrat" (p. 85), and Ellison A. Smyth, the South Carolina industrialist, is confused with Ellison D. Smith, the cotton Senator (*passim*). This reviewer, however, only wishes that the same competent hands may continue the history of Southern social legislation admirably launched in this book.

University of Florida

C. VANN WOODWARD

Carter Glass: Unreconstructed Rebel. By James E. Palmer. (Roanoke, Virginia: The Institute of American Biography, 1938. Pp. 320. Illustrations, bibliography. \$3.25.)

The career of a man like Carter Glass is seldom if ever equaled in American history, and many will be the biographies and studies connected with his life. This first published biography presents an interesting account of the small-town

editor with no practical banking experience, who as congressman became such a master of banking and finance that he was able to tell recalcitrant Wall Street and Main Street bankers what was wrong and what was needed. In the House he effectively met criticism aimed at the projected Federal Reserve system by more experienced men, and he lived long enough to see that system so firmly established that business men and financial leaders came to look upon him as their guardian, the "Dean of Finance." In that long career as editor, congressman, secretary of the treasury, and senator he built a reputation for integrity, pungency, frankness, and courage that aroused the envy and admiration of enemies as well as friends. His criticism of the New Deal is not the only act of rebellion or criticism within his own party. For years he criticized the methods and political principles of the Martin Democratic machine in Virginia and at one time openly challenged and nearly defeated it. He was appointed to the Senate by one of the chief opponents of that machine.

The present volume has both weak and strong points. Details of the early career of Glass would reveal more similarity between his fight for the Federal Reserve and the campaign he carried on against those allied with "sound money" in the 1890's than is shown in the statement that Glass favored free silver because he did not know anything about currency at the time. His remedy might have been wrong, but his editorial analysis of the national situation was surprisingly accurate in view of subsequent developments. The author says the New Deal is Hamiltonian and Glass's criticism thereof is Jeffersonian. His positiveness on this point weakens the book, for certainly many thorough students of Jefferson seriously disagree and say that such an interpretation results from confusion of Jefferson's principles with the tools or means by which he would realize those principles. No attempt is made to conceal the fact that the preparation of the book was a labor of love and admiration. One might reasonably question the point of view that proclaims "Carter Glass . . . consistently right through all these tumultuous years" (p. 258). Also it is surprising to read the statement, unsupported by evidence, that Glass would probably have received the Democratic nomination in 1920 or 1924 had it not been for his distaste for the game of politics as ordinarily played and his consideration for his friend, William G. McAdoo (pp. 148, 167). The chapter on the Federal Reserve is clear, concise, and well written, while that in defense of Wilson needs reworking and revision in the interest of coherence.

In preparing the work the author made use of Glass's speeches, many conversations with the Senator and others, and to some extent private papers. Some bad factual errors are apparent, although many of them are errors in printing which should have been removed in the proofreading. The president of William and Mary was not William C. Brown (p. 295).

The style is not sprightly nor the method scholarly, but as a whole the author has done a valuable piece of pioneer work in the life of a most important man.

Washington and Lee University

ALLEN W. MOGER

George W. Truett: A Biography. By Powhatan W. James. (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1939. Pp. xv, 281. Illustrations, \$2.50.)

"Each page of this work by the gifted pastor of the First Baptist Church, Tuscaloosa, Alabama, produces tears of joy and gratitude on the cheek of every loyal Southern Baptist," runs a comment on this "authorized" biography of a really great clergyman. But such emotional expressions revolving about an emotional book make a serene and sober review appear flippant, or at least petty. A biography of a man still living, and still very active, by a fellow preacher and son-in-law, will be received with caution outside of evangelical circles—especially when the birthplace of the subject has already been established as an official shrine (p. 17).

George Washington Truett was born in North Carolina on May 6, 1867. While yet in his teens he crossed to Georgia as a teacher, and at twenty founded an academy which in two years boasted three hundred students. At twenty-three he became financial agent for Baylor University and raised \$92,000 to pay off its debt, giving his own entire fortune to the cause. At twenty-six he entered that institution as a student, and, upon graduation, accepted a call to the First Baptist Church of Dallas where he has served since. He has refused the presidency of Baylor; served as a chaplain in France; held annual camp meetings for the cowboys of West Texas; made Dallas a great Baptist center; was several times chosen president of the Southern Baptist Association; was elected president of the World Baptist Alliance at Berlin in 1934; and has become one of the great figures of America as a pastor and a preacher.

No one can justly deny that Dr. Truett is all that his kinsman says that he is. But the adjectives are poured on rather thickly. To adulate Dr. Truett is somewhat like "painting the lily" or decorating the Taj Mahal. Dr. Truett does not need it.

The impartial reader will note several vital omissions in this "authorized" biography. Although other prominent Baptists are mentioned in their relations with Dr. Truett, they do not stand on their own feet. Seemingly the author has no consciousness that religious bodies exist in Texas other than Baptists. Although the Hayden-Cranfill controversy is discussed in two or three pages, the Reverend J. Frank Norris and his group are completely ignored—doubtless in the interest of harmony—which is like writing a biography of Washington and ignoring the Revolution. It is not, therefore, a definitive biography. It was, however, written to serve a lofty purpose—to rally a denomination—and it will do that.

Historical News and Notices

The fifth annual meeting of the Southern Historical Association will convene in Lexington, Kentucky, November 2-4. The following is the tentative program, complete except for a paper on Southern literature and the selection of presiding officers, as announced by the Program Committee chairman, James W. Patton. This year the meetings are to begin on Thursday afternoon rather than in the morning to allow sufficient time for members to arrive. The session scheduled for the first afternoon will be devoted to "Non-Southerners in the South." D. H. Gilpatrick, Furman University, will present a paper on "Refugee Journalists," Philip D. Jordan, Miami University, has selected the topic, "Northern Singers in the Ante-Bellum South," and Ella Lonn, Goucher College, will complete the program with a paper on "Foreigners in the Confederacy." Thursday night, members of the Association will be honored with a complimentary dinner, tendered by citizens of Lexington and members of the Kentucky State Historical Society, the Bradford Historical Society, and the Filson Club. The presiding officer will be H. V. McChesney, and two papers will be read, "R. J. Breckinridge," by Hambleton Tapp, Louisville Male High School, and "The Supreme Court for the District of Kentucky, 1782-1892," by Judge Samuel M. Wilson. Two programs are listed for Friday morning developing the subjects, "Southern Indians" and "Economic History of the Ante-Bellum South." The first will include the following topics: "Indian Contributions to Southern Culture," by Peter A. Brannon, Alabama State Archives, "Cherokee Culture" (tentative title), by Morris L. Wardell, University of Oklahoma, and "Archaeological Discoveries in the Tennessee Valley," by T. M. N. Lewis, University of Tennessee. The other meeting will hear the following papers: "Relations between Planter and Factor in the Rice Industry," by J. H. Easterby, College of Charleston, "The Credit System and the Cotton Trade," by Thomas P. Govan, University of Chattanooga, and "Economic Phases of Sugar Planting," by J. Carlyle Sitterson, University of North Carolina. At noon Friday, a luncheon followed by the regular annual business meeting and the election of officers will be held. A "General Session on the Civil War and Reconstruction," is called for Friday afternoon, to be followed by a general discussion. James G. Randall, University of Illinois, will read a paper on "The Civil War Re-examined," and Howard K. Beale, University of North Carolina, will discuss a topic tentatively entitled "Re-writing the History of the Reconstruction Period." The Annual Dinner will be held

as usual on Friday night and at that time Charles S. Sydnor will present his presidential address.

Saturday morning the Association members will have the choice of attending either the session upon "Aspects of Southern Church History," or the meeting having as its general subject, "Southern Relations with Europe." Phases of Southern church history that are to be discussed are: "The Reunion of the Episcopal Church, 1865," by Henry T. Shanks, Birmingham-Southern College, "The Methodist Church in the Post-Bellum Period" (tentative title), by Hunter D. Farish, Colonial Williamsburg, Incorporated, and "The Presbyterian Church U. S. A. and Southern Reconstruction," by Oliver S. Heckman, Pennsylvania Department of Education, Harrisburg. The second-named general topic will embrace the following papers: "French Interests in the Annexation of Texas," by Richard A. McLemore, State Teachers College, Hattiesburg, Mississippi, "European Factors Affecting Southern Trade," by Thomas P. Martin, Library of Congress, and "A Georgian at the Court of the Hapsburgs," by C. Lee Harwell, Emory University Junior College. The final meeting will be a luncheon conference on Southern literature, tendered with the compliments of Transylvania College. The paper, "Southern Story-Telling in the New York *Spirit of the Times*, 1835-1860," by Franklin J. Meine, Chicago, has been designated for this program and another is to be arranged.

PERSONAL

Recent appointments among the Southern universities and colleges include Josephine Hege and Christiana McFadyen as instructors in history, Woman's College of the University of North Carolina, to replace Katherine Strateman and Jane Lohrer who have resigned to be married; Georgia Robison, assistant professor of history at Hollins College; Henry L. Swint, instructor in history at Vanderbilt University; Rembert W. Patrick, assistant professor of history at Meredith College; Judson C. Ward, Jr., instructor in history at South Georgia State Teachers College; Stuart Noblin, instructor in history at the College of Charleston. Vernon L. Wharton will return to Millsaps College as assistant professor of history.

Summer appointments not previously listed include David A. Lockmiller, North Carolina State College, who taught at Emory University, and Elizabeth Cometti, who taught at the Woman's College of the University of North Carolina.

Promotions in the University of Kentucky department of history include the following: J. Huntley Dupre from associate professor to full professor; Thomas D. Clark from assistant professor to the rank of associate professor. At the University of Arkansas, Dorsey D. Jones has been advanced from the rank of asso-

ciate professor to that of professor and W. C. Askew from the rank of instructor to that of assistant professor.

H. C. Nixon will relieve Elmer Ellis, University of Missouri, for the next year while the latter is on leave of absence. Jonas Viles will teach only part time for the first semester in order to complete his study of the history of the University of Missouri.

A. S. Venable, University of Arkansas, has received a grant-in-aid from the Social Science Research Council for work on his "Public Career of William L. Yancey."

Ellery L. Hall, University of Kentucky, is spending the summer in London doing research in the British archives.

There have been several recent changes in the personnel of the Historical Records Survey that will interest Southern historians. P. L. Rainwater resigned as director of the survey in Mississippi July 15; Mona Evans, formerly instructor in history at Mississippi State College for Women and for some years connected with the WPA, joined the Mississippi staff July 1; Ike Moore, who has resigned as state supervisor of the survey in Texas to become director of the San Jacinto Museum of History, has been succeeded by Charles Hodges, former assistant state supervisor; Dan Lacy, state director of the North Carolina survey, has been appointed regional supervisor of the survey work in Kentucky, Tennessee, North Carolina, South Carolina, Alabama, Georgia, and Florida; Morris Radoff, field supervisor of the Historical Records Survey for Maryland, Virginia, and West Virginia, has been appointed archivist of the state of Maryland, succeeding the late Dr. James A. Robertson; Burnis Walker, in charge of the Early American Imprints Survey in Louisiana, has resigned to accept a position with the Library of Congress to work on the Union Catalog.

J. Carlisle Sitterson of the University of North Carolina delivered on January 11 an address, "The Influence of Men of the Lower Cape Fear upon Late Colonial Development," at the annual pilgrimage of the North Carolina Society, Colonial Dames of America, to the ruins of St. Phillips Church, Brunswick County.

The American Library Association will have as its representative to the fifteenth International Conference on Documentation at Zurich, Switzerland, August 10-13, Vernon D. Tate, chief of the Division of Photographic Archives and Research, The National Archives. While in Europe Dr. Tate will study methods of photographic reproduction.

Roscoe R. Hill, chief of the Division of Classification, The National Archives,

has been honored by the *Academia de la Historia de Cuba* which conferred upon him the rank of *Académico Correspondiente* in recognition of his work as a historian.

Miss Irene A. Wright has resigned her position in the Division of Reference, The National Archives, to accept an appointment in the Division of Cultural Relations of the Department of State.

The death of Dr. James A. Robertson, March 20, 1939, closed the career of a scholar who was long identified with Southern history. His interest centered in the areas of the United States which were once under Spanish domination. He made his contribution by editing documents relating to Spanish Louisiana and Florida and, as editor of the *Hispanic American Historical Review*, gave much attention to this same field. Always interested in documentary sources, he devoted much time to securing from the Spanish archives photo copies and transcripts of documents relating to the history of Florida. His last years were spent as Archivist of the State of Maryland, during which time he brought together in the Hall of Records many colonial documents and laid the foundations for a model state department of archives. He was ever ready to encourage and aid younger students who undertook studies regarding the Spanish phases of Southern history. His counsel and advice will be greatly missed, and by his going the readers and friends of the *Journal of Southern History* have suffered a distinct loss. [Roscoe R. Hill]

Edward Everett Dale was honored for his twenty-five years of service in the department of history at the University of Oklahoma by a testimonial dinner, May 15.

John Tate Lanning, associate professor of history in Duke University, has been appointed managing editor of the *Hispanic American Historical Review* to succeed the late Dr. Robertson. Alan K. Manchester, also of the Duke University history faculty, has been appointed associate managing editor.

"Sources of the South's Social and Economic Problems," was the general theme for the Conference on Southern Life and Culture, which met at Louisiana State University, April 17 and 18. The sessions for the first day included the following subjects and speakers: "Obstacles to Intellectual Progress in the South," by Gerald W. Johnson, associate editor, Baltimore *Evening Sun*, "Cultural Elements Differentiating the South from Other Regions," by Howard W. Odum, University of North Carolina, and "The Interterritorial Freight-Rate Situation as a Problem of the South," by John H. Goff, Tennessee Valley Authority. The program for the second day began with a paper by Francis W. Coker, Yale University, on "The Relation of Southern Political Ideas to Present Maladjustments." A round-table discussion, "The Economic Basis of Sectional Politics in

the South," was led by Arthur N. Holcombe, Harvard University. In the afternoon Doak S. Campbell, George Peabody College for Teachers, presented a paper entitled "Why the South Lags in Education." The final meeting was held on Tuesday evening. Each meeting was followed by a discussion with prominent educators and administrators presiding.

The Dancy Foundation Lectures were given by Douglas Southall Freeman, at Alabama College, April 27 and 28. The lectures had as their general subject, "The South to Posterity: A Review of Southern Historical Literature and Memoirs Since 1865." The topic was considered in three divisions, "Writing in the Ashes," "The Appeal to the Records," and "Apotheosis and Realism."

John C. L. Andreassen, regional supervisor Historical Records Survey, read a paper March 31 before the Florida Library Association at Mount Plymouth, Florida, on the survey in the Southeastern states.

S. C. Dellinger, curator of the museum of the University of Arkansas, has secured a grant of \$115,000 from WPA for archaeological excavations.

Grants-in-aid of research in American history will be available for 1940 from the Rutherford B. Hayes—Lucy Webb Hayes Foundation of the Hayes Memorial Library. "The Trustees of the Hayes Foundation are prepared to offer a number of grants-in-aid to individual students to assist them in carrying on studies in American History, within the period from the Civil War to the Spanish American War. The Committee is particularly interested in the economic, educational and cultural history of the South, the reconciliation and knitting together of the sections, the history of the development of federal and state administration, and some phases of cultural, social and political history of the United States as well as of Ohio commencing in the eighteen-forties."

Applications must be in before January 15. Those who may wish further information concerning the grants should address their inquiries to Curtis W. Garrison, Secretary for the Committee on Grants of the Hayes Foundation, Hayes Memorial Library, Fremont, Ohio.

HISTORICAL SOCIETIES

The Mississippi Valley Historical Association held its thirty-second annual meeting in Memphis, Tennessee, April 20-22. James G. Randall, University of Illinois, was elected president of the Association; Charles H. Ambler, West Virginia University, Dwight L. Dumond, University of Michigan, and Everett Dick, Union College, Nebraska, were elected members of the executive committee for three years; Merle Curti, Columbia University, and George F. Howe, University of Cincinnati, were appointed members of the board of editors of the

Mississippi Valley Historical Review for three years; and Burr W. Phillips, University of Minnesota, Chester McA. Destler, South Georgia Teachers College, and Robert M. La Follett, Ball State Teachers College, were appointed members of the executive committee for three years.

The Southern Historical Association and the Mississippi Valley Historical Association held two joint meetings at Memphis. The first was a dinner, April 21, with Charles W. Ramsdell as toastmaster. A regular session, April 22, treating the general subject "Some Phases of Town Life in the Ante-Bellum South," had as its chairman, Frank L. Owsley, vice-president of the Southern Historical Association. The following papers were read: Mack Swearingen, "New Orleans: A Missed Opportunity for Cultural Leadership"; F. Garvin Davenport, "Scientific Interests in Ante-Bellum Nashville"; and Gerald M. Capers, Jr., "Ante-Bellum Memphis: A Study of Its Commercial Interests." There were several other papers which dealt with subjects of Southern import, the account of which will appear in the September issue of the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*.

The Oklahoma Historical Society held its annual meeting at Durant on May 11. A trip was made to the historic Fort Washita. In the evening in the auditorium of the state college at Durant, addresses were presented by Judge John B. Meserve of Tulsa on the Chickasaw Indians, and by Rex Strickland of the El Paso branch of the University of Texas on "Miller County Arkansas Territory, the Frontier that Men Forget." The following day a tour of historical sites included Old Wheelock Church, which has stood from pre-Civil War days; Fort Towson; the grave of Robert M. Jones, distinguished Choctaw Confederate delegate to the Richmond government; and the Goodland Indian Orphanage, which has been in continuous service since ante-bellum years.

The Georgia Historical Society celebrated in Savannah, May 24, the centennial of its founding. During the afternoon a pilgrimage was made to Fort Pulaski, Bonaventure, Bethesda, and Wormsoe; in the evening a banquet was held at the Hotel Savannah. Avery Craven of the University of Chicago made the principal address, on "Georgia and the South." Other speakers were S. V. Sanford, chancellor of the University System of Georgia, Edward Alexander Parsons, president of the Louisiana Historical Society, and Judge A. B. Lovett, former president of the Georgia Historical Society. J. Randolph Anderson, president of the society, was toastmaster.

The Florida Historical Society held a two-day joint meeting with the Jacksonville Historical Society in Jacksonville and Fernandina, May 2 and 3. A luncheon and policy conference of the officers and directors of the state society at the Roosevelt Hotel, Jacksonville, inaugurated the meeting. On the first afternoon,

members and guests of the state and local societies toured Fort George Island, where brief descriptive talks were made by Mrs. Millar Wilson and Carita Doggett Corse of Jacksonville, and W. J. Winter of St. Augustine. In the evening a dinner was held at the Roosevelt Hotel, presided over by Joshua C. Chase, former president of the state society. The guest speaker at the dinner, Charles E. Bennett, presented a paper on the history of Fort Caroline. Judge J. Ollie Edmunds, first vice-president of the local society, presided at the evening session. Subjects and speakers included, "Life of James Ormond," by William Barfield, and "Inventories of Archives as Tools for the Historian," by Luther H. Evans, National Director, Historical Records Survey.

On the second day, members assembled at the Keystone Hotel, Fernandina. Judge Burton Barrs, Jacksonville, presided and introduced the following speakers: William J. Deegan, Jr., "Address of Welcome"; George E. Wolff, "A Brief Historical Sketch of Fernandina"; Robert Edwards, "J. J. Dickison, the Francis Marion of Florida"; Joella Hughes, "Life of Jean Ribaut." Thomas M. Carnegie, Jr., was unavoidably absent, and his paper, "The Relationship of Cumberland Island to Florida," was read by Mrs. A. F. Wilson, of Ormond Beach. The meeting adjourned to Fort Clinch where Mrs. Linwood Jeffreys, State Conservation Board, gave a brief history of the Fort, and Mr. and Mrs. W. N. Galphin of Fernandina, presented a set of Florida flags to the Fort Clinch State Park. The two-day meeting was brought to a close with a seafood luncheon at picturesque Gerbing's, where George W. Gibbs, nephew of General Duncan L. Clinch, served as toastmaster. Large exhibits of Florida history materials were displayed at the Jacksonville Public Library and at the Keystone Hotel in Fernandina.

A special committee on archaeology was announced at a board meeting of the Florida Historical Society, May 2, by the president, A. J. Hanna, Rollins College. Its purpose is to arouse interest and stimulate responsibility in the preservation of archaeological remains in Florida, to develop studies in and disseminate information about Florida archaeology, and to encourage the establishment of a department of anthropology (including archaeology) in one or more of the colleges or universities of Florida. W. J. Winter of the Carnegie Institute, now stationed at St. Augustine, was named chairman of this committee.

An informal meeting of members and guests of the Florida Historical Society in Central Florida was held in Winter Park, May 27, to hear John R. Swanton of the Smithsonian Institution speak on the work of the De Soto Quadricentennial Commission, of which he is chairman, and describe the route followed by De Soto on his expedition through Florida.

A celebration was held on January 25 in the new North Carolina Hall of History when the Seaboard Air Line Railway presented to the North Carolina Historical Commission a full-size replica of the *Raleigh*, first locomotive to

operate on the Raleigh and Gaston Railroad, a line which now forms a part of the Seaboard.

The Greensboro, North Carolina, Historical Museum was opened at its new quarters with a formal celebration on April 29.

On June 7 a celebration was held at the old Dickson house, near Hillsboro, North Carolina, which has recently been restored. This house is thought to have been the headquarters of General Joseph E. Johnston when he surrendered to Sherman.

Governor Clyde R. Hoey and others addressed a meeting, May 4, gathered to celebrate the one-hundred-seventy-fifth anniversary of the founding of New Bern (North Carolina) Academy.

The North Carolina General Assembly has authorized the erection on Capitol Square of a memorial to the late Captain Samuel A'Court Ashe, historian and editor, who died on October 10, 1938.

Announcement is made by Kenneth Chorley, president of Colonial Williamsburg, Incorporated, of the appointment of a committee of historians to assist in an advisory capacity in the historical work of the Department of Research and Record of the Restoration. Members of this advisory committee will participate primarily in connection with the projected series of historical and scholarly publications on colonial Virginia life which has been undertaken by the department. Invitations to serve on this committee have been accepted by Thomas Jefferson Wertenbaker, Princeton University; Charles M. Andrews, Yale University; Arthur M. Schlesinger, and Samuel E. Morison, Harvard University; Virginus Dabney, *Richmond Times Dispatch*; Earl G. Swem, and Richard L. Morton, College of William and Mary. Members of this committee are to convene in Williamsburg from time to time. Their first conference was to be held June 20-21.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL

An Early Description of Middle Tennessee (Chicago: Privately printed, 1939, pp. 8), by E. Bushnell, edited, with an introductory note, by Douglas C. McMurtrie, was handed to members in attendance at the Memphis meeting of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association. The letter was taken from the columns of the New-London *Connecticut Gazette*, November 21, 1788. Mr. McMurtrie says in his introduction that "Bushnell's description of the country in the vicinity of Nashville may have been a bit over-enthusiastic, but it was letters such as his which set in motion and kept moving the westward stream of migration, which was responsible for the rapid growth in population and wealth of the west."

Two mimeographed inventories by the Historical Records Survey have been received recently in the *Journal* office. The *Inventory of the County Archives of Arkansas, No. 12, Cleburne County* (Little Rock: Historical Records Survey, 1939, pp. 217), is the first volume to be issued by the Survey in that state. The sixth *Inventory of the Parish Archives of Louisiana* is No. 44, *St. Bernard Parish* (University, Louisiana: The Department of Archives, Louisiana State University, 1938, pp. 166). In both inventories the historian will find the historical sketches of the locality and the discussion of local governmental organization immediately valuable; their usefulness as a guide to unprinted sources will be generally recognized.

The publication of the *Journal of the History of Ideas* will be a valuable and welcome addition to scholarly journals. It is intended as a medium for the publication of researches which cross the customary boundary lines or are likely to be of common interest to students in different fields of the history of philosophy, of literature and the arts, of the natural and social sciences, of religion, and of political and social movements. Arthur O. Lovejoy, Johns Hopkins University, has been chosen editor, to be assisted by Philip P. Wiener, managing editor, and Joseph T. Shipley, assistant editor.

Delegates from leading educational institutions in the United States and foreign countries attended the centennial celebration of Duke University, April 21-23. Duke University Press has published several interesting works as a part of the commemoration of the centennial. Reviews of these works appear in this and subsequent issues of the *Journal*.

Recent acquisitions to the Southern Historical Collection of the University of North Carolina include: the papers of Hugh McGavock of Rockbridge County, Virginia; an addition to the Jacob M. Dickinson Papers; a collection of fifty letters to and from Felix Grundy; a marriage record book and autograph album kept by the Reverend Archibald McFadyen of North Carolina; five plantation records, 1861-1865, of Phanor Prudhomme of Bermuda Plantation, Natchitoches Parish, Louisiana; the papers of Theodore Richmond of Ohio and Tennessee; the order book kept by Colonel S. H. Lockett, who was in charge of the defenses of Vicksburg; the papers of Marion Butler, of North Carolina, Populist leader and United States senator; the papers of William A. Graham, governor of North Carolina, United States senator, secretary of the navy, member of the secession convention, president *pro tem* of the Confederate Senate, member of the Peabody Board and the Maryland-Virginia boundary commission; the papers of Matt W. Ransom, attorney general of North Carolina, Confederate general, United States senator, and minister to Mexico; a collection of papers of Governor James McDowell of Virginia; a collection of letters of Mary Moore Watters of Wilmington, North Carolina; a few important letters and other

papers of Franklin H. Elmore of South Carolina; the diary of Grace Elmore; the papers of Elmer Roberts of Indiana and Florida, for many years a European representative of the Associated Press; the diary of Kate S. Carney of Murfreesboro, Tennessee; an account and record book of Charles Henry Campfield of Georgia; one volume of the diary of Moses Young Henderson of Georgia; two volumes of the diary of Laura Beecher (Mrs. James) Comer of Alabama; a large addition to the Elliott-Mackay-Stiles Papers; a collection of the papers of Dr. J. Marion Sims, the eminent surgeon, a native of South Carolina; twenty-eight additional volumes of the Arthur P. Gorman scrapbooks; the plantation diary of Alexander J. Lawton of Beaufort District, South Carolina; the Appleton-Arnold Papers, including many letters and many volumes of the diary of Louisa Arnold Appleton; the papers of the Dickens family of Fairfax, Virginia, including numerous important record books; a typewritten copy of the diary of Joseph Cottrell of Florida; a typewritten copy of the Civil War letters of Captain George Cadman, United States army; diary of Margaret Anne Ulmer of Grove Hill, Alabama; and the papers of William L. Saunders, Confederate soldier, editor, secretary of state of North Carolina, secretary of the Board of Trustees of the University of North Carolina for many years, and editor of the *Colonial Records of North Carolina*.

The Filson Club has purchased a large assortment of newspapers from Georgetown College.

Recent acquisitions of the Mississippi Department of Archives and History include: opinions of the attorney general, February 1-April 28, 1893, June 22, 1894-September 19, 1895, January 15, 1900-September 2, 1930; record of charters, February 9, 1910-December 21, 1932; Supreme Court docket, October term, 1903-October term, 1910; civil docket, March term, 1900-October term, 1901, October term, 1920-March term, 1928; criminal docket, October term, 1913-March term, 1919. The following acquisitions are particularly valuable for the researcher in Mississippi history: Mississippi *Senate Journal*, fourth session, January 1-February 10, 1821; fifth session, November 5-November 27, 1821; fifth session, June 3-June 29, 1822; sixth session, December 23, 1822-January 21, 1823; seventh session, December 22, 1823-January 23, 1824; eighth session, January 3-February 4, 1825.

The Department has also acquired the papers of Brigadier General Thomas J. McKean relating to the Battle of Corinth. These contain field dispatches, casualty lists, general orders, telegrams, and reports of commanding and minor officers. Some of the famous names, besides McKean, that are signed to the various documents are Grant, Rosecrans, Kirby, McArthur, William T. Clark, and G. Goddard.

Valuable manuscript materials have recently been added and others made

available to the McClung Historical Room of Lawson McGhee Library, Knoxville, Tennessee. About 500 papers of William B. Lenoir, merchant and founder of Lenoir City, have been acquired. The J. Hays Allin Papers, which deal with real estate business in Chattanooga, the Presbyterian Church in East Tennessee, and the Allin family, have been calendared. The T. A. R. Nelson Papers, of about 6,000 pieces, are being calendared and will be completed in a few months. Nelson, a member of Congress from East Tennessee during the Civil War period, was in touch with the political and social life of the section from 1830 to 1870. These papers, mainly correspondence, include some Andrew Johnson and "Parson" W. G. Brownlow letters. The Will A. McTeer Papers, of about 12,000 pieces, are arranged and available for use. McTeer was a prominent lawyer and Presbyterian leader of Maryville, Tennessee, and his papers, 1876-1918, consist of personal, commercial, and legal material and account books relating to Maryville College. A collection valuable for its political and legal information, the Leonidas C. Houk and John C. Houk Papers, about 30,000 pieces covering the period 1870-1923, is ready for use. The Houks were lawyers and Republican congressmen from Tennessee. The arrangement of the manuscripts was made possible through the aid of the Historical Records Survey.

Papers concerning the Burr conspiracy and the preparations to try Aaron Burr and Harmon Blennerhassett in the United States Circuit Court at Chillicothe, Ohio, in 1808, have been transferred to The National Archives from the United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio. The documents date from 1805 to 1808 and include the recognizances of the defendants given at Richmond, Virginia, following the trials there; the bills of indictment returned by the Ohio grand jury, charging Burr and Blennerhassett with high misdemeanors; and various evidentiary papers.

Experiences of the American privateer *Yankee* in African waters are described in a fragmentary log found among customhouse records in The National Archives. The log covers the period from October 9, 1814, to January 20, 1815, and tells of several naval engagements and of a visit to Boa Vista, one of the Cape Verde Islands. Also of interest to students of American maritime history is the receipt by The National Archives from the Bureau of Customs of bodies of correspondence with collectors of customs, 1789-1907, and from the customhouse in New York, of crew lists of vessels entering or clearing there, 1803-1919, and shipping articles for the crews of ships sailing thence, 1840-1914.

Other records recently transferred include correspondence of the Division of Insolvent National Banks, from the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, 1865-1937; maps, many of which deal with the Seminole Indian wars in Florida, from the Office of the Chief of Engineers, 1817-1857; personnel records relating to the Department of Justice and the Federal judiciary, 1870-1908; requisitions and contracts from the Bureau of Ordnance, 1899-1935; correspondence of the

Forester's Office, 1883-1905; correspondence relating to entomological activities, from the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, 1883-1924; and records of the International Fisheries Commissions established in 1908 and 1924.

During the past twelve months the Department of Archives of Louisiana State University has acquired more than one hundred collections of manuscripts. The most important are as follows: The Blankenstein and Veiner Collection, 400 vols. (1890-1933), contains the records of a Natchez wholesale grocery store in a period when the trade area of that city was contracting in size. The Dupont Collection, 78 vols. (1893-1933), comprises the records of a store at Houma, Louisiana, which served a large trade region. The Hartzell Papers, 735 items (1864-1874, 1899-1906), embrace the correspondence of Reverend J. C. Hartzell as pastor of the Ames Methodist Episcopal Church (North) in New Orleans, and later as Bishop of Africa. The Mandeville Papers, 1692 items (1816-1893), constitute records of a prominent Natchez family; many phases of non-political ante-bellum life are mirrored—the activities of women in Natchez homes and near-by plantations; the efforts of a young man to obtain a beginning in New Orleans business life; fashions, morals, epidemics, theatricals, music, and dancing in New Orleans, Natchez, Hot Springs, and New York; life behind the lines and at the front during the Civil War; and the business of the Planters Bank of Natchez. The Minor Collection, 1,287 items (1793-1898), is strong in data concerning speculation in land and cotton in the 1830's; the management of four plantations in the Natchez region from 1840 to 1870; treatment of Negroes; the effect of the Civil War on Mississippi Negroes; planters' relationships with several Mississippi banks; and horse racing. The collection includes plantation diaries, 1847-1870. The Meullion Papers, 121 items (1776-1906), contain significant materials on free Negroes in St. Landry Parish, Louisiana. The Shealy Papers, 51 items (1859, 1862), include the wartime impressions of the privations and horrors of camp and hospital life in Virginia. The most important part of the Stratton Collection, 67 items (1746-1903), is the diary (1843-1903) of Reverend J. B. Stratton, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Natchez. The diary of Clara Solomon, 250 pp. in 4 vols. (1861-1862), is an intimate account of the life of a New Orleans woman during the Civil War. The Taylor Collection, 2,095 items (1813-1913), is rich in materials on the lumber industry, land speculation, saltmaking, and education in southwestern Mississippi and southern Louisiana in the three decades ending in 1870.

ARTICLES ON THE STATES OF THE UPPER SOUTH

"Tchaikowsky's Visit to Baltimore," by James Morfit Mullen, in the *Maryland Historical Magazine* (March).

"Ships and Shipping of Seventeenth Century Maryland," continued, by V. J. Wyckoff, *ibid.*

- "The First American Edition of Captain John Smith's *True Travels and General Historie*," by Richard Beale Davis, in the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* (April).
- "The Seed from Which Virginia Grew," by George Arents, in the *William and Mary College Quarterly Historical Magazine* (April).
- "Lt. Col. Leven Powell," by James D. Evans, *ibid.*
- "'Mr' in Virginia Records before 1776," by Charles Edgar Gilliam, *ibid.*
- "The Colonial Churches of York County, Virginia," by George Carrington Mason, *ibid.*
- "Agricultural Science and Education in Virginia before 1860," by Ralph M. Brown, *ibid.*
- "Economic Conditions in North Carolina about 1780," I, by Francis G. Morris and Phyllis M. Morris, in the *North Carolina Historical Review* (April).
- "Economic Sectionalism in Ante-Bellum North Carolina," by Joseph Carlyle Sitterson, *ibid.*
- "The Plank Road Movement in North Carolina," II, by Robert B. Starling, *ibid.*
- "The Land Title to Liberty Hall," by Willard Rouse Jillson, in the *Register of the Kentucky State Historical Society* (April).
- "A Sketch of the Life and Times of Rebecca Witten Graham, of Floyd County, Kentucky, 1775-1843," by *id.*, *ibid.*
- "John Graham of Virginia and Kentucky, 1765-1835," by *id.*, in the *Filson Club History Quarterly* (April).
- "Matthew Harris Jouett, Kentucky Portrait Painter, A Review," by Samuel M. Wilson, *ibid.*
- "Kentucky and the Greek War of Independence, 1821-1828," by Huntley Dupre, *ibid.*
- "Educational Opportunities in Early Missouri," I, by Margaret McMillan and Monia Cook Morris, in the *Missouri Historical Review* (April).
- "The War of 1812 on the Missouri Frontier," III, by Kate L. Gregg, *ibid.*
- "Peter James Hudson," by R. L. Williams, in the *Chronicles of Oklahoma* (March).
- "A Story of Choctaw Chiefs," by Peter James Hudson, *ibid.*
- "Chief Colonel Johnson Harris," by John Bartlett Meserve, *ibid.*
- "A Brief History of Early Higher Education among the Baptists of Oklahoma," by Fred G. Watts, *ibid.*
- "Early Creek Missions," by Roland Hinds, *ibid.*
- "Early History of Noble County," by Allen D. Fitchett, *ibid.*

DOCUMENTS AND COMPILATIONS ON THE STATES OF THE UPPER SOUTH

- "Seventeenth Century Books Relating to Maryland," by John W. Garrett, in the *Maryland Historical Magazine* (March).

- "A Letter from Samuel Morse, the Inventor of the Telegraph," contributed by James A. Robertson, *ibid.*
- "The Sculptured Panels of Old St. Paul's Church, Baltimore," by I. T. Frary, *ibid.*
- "Stricker Letters," contributed by Alice Harris Brent, *ibid.*
- "'Smithfield' Home of the Prestons, in Montgomery County, Virginia," by Janie P. B. Lamb, in the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* (April).
- "Notes from the Records of Stafford County, Virginia, Order Books," continued, *ibid.*
- "Hinges from Old Houses," by Rev. and Mrs. Arthur P. Gray, *ibid.*
- "Marriage License Records of Northumberland County, Virginia, from 1735 to 1795 as Recorded in Clerk's Fee Books," concluded, compiled by Lillian A. Hatton, *ibid.*
- "Letters from Old Trunks: A Letter from Agnes Sarah Bell Cabell," edited by Mr. and Mrs. John H. Guy, *ibid.*
- "Montgomery County's Revolutionary Heritage," concluded, compiled by Ruby A. Roberts, *ibid.*
- "William and Mary College as a Hospital in 1862," contributed by Fred W. Cross, in the *William and Mary College Quarterly and Historical Magazine* (April).
- "George Tucker's Description of Williamsburg in 1796," copied by John C. Wyllie, *ibid.*
- "Note from Surry County Records Which Relates to Education," contributed by Mrs. Victor W. Stewart, *ibid.*
- "Notes from Surry County Records Which Relate to Seventeenth Century Houses," contributed by Robert Hunt Land, *ibid.*
- "Cumberland County Papers and Lists of Colonial Soldiers," contributed by W. S. Morton, *ibid.*
- "Unpublished Letters from North Carolina to Polk," continued, by Elizabeth G. McPherson, in the *North Carolina Historical Review* (April).
- "North Carolina Bibliography, 1937-1938," compiled by Mary Lindsay Thornton, *ibid.*
- "Mercer County, Kentucky, Abstracts of Will Books 3 and 4," in the *Register of the Kentucky State Historical Society* (April).
- "Kentucky Marriages and Obituaries," continued, compiled and edited by G. Glenn Clift, *ibid.*
- "Letters of James Chamberlayne Pickett," edited by James A. Padgett, *ibid.*
- "Letters of George Caleb Bingham to James S. Rollins," VII, edited by C. B. Rollins, in the *Missouri Historical Review* (April).

- "The Opening of Oklahoma from the European Point of View," translated and edited by H. C. Peterson, in the *Chronicles of Oklahoma* (March).
- "Autobiography of Governor A. J. Seay," edited by Dan W. Peery, *ibid.*
- "The Cherokee Commission at Kickapoo Village," edited by Berlin B. Chapman, *ibid.*

ARTICLES ON THE STATES OF THE LOWER SOUTH

- "Spanish Mission Sites in Florida," by Mark F. Boyd, in the *Florida Historical Quarterly* (April).
- "Governor Johnstone in West Florida," by C. N. Howard, *ibid.*
- "The Parentage and Birthplace of Osceola," by Charles H. Coe, *ibid.*
- "The Legend of Sir Walter Raleigh at Savannah," by Dolores B. Floyd, in the *Georgia Historical Quarterly* (June).
- "Causton's Bluff, Deptford, Brewton Hill: Three Allied Plantations," II, Savannah Unit, Federal Writers' Project, *ibid.*
- "The Bank of Hamburg, South Carolina," by Charles G. Cordle, *ibid.*
- "The Graviers and the Faubourg Ste. Marie," by Francis P. Burns, in the *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* (April).
- "The Early History of the Episcopal Church in New Orleans, 1805-1840," by Georgia Fairbanks Taylor, *ibid.*
- "J. D. B. De Bow and the Seventh Census," by Ottis Clark Skipper, *ibid.*
- "'Who Killa De Chief?' " by John S. Kendall, *ibid.*

DOCUMENTS AND COMPILATIONS ON THE STATES OF THE LOWER SOUTH

- "Taken from the Historical Records of the 30th Regiment in South Carolina, 1775," contributed by Allen French, in the *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* (April).
- "Journal of Gen. Peter Horry," continued, edited by A. S. Salley, *ibid.*
- "The Thomas Elfe Account Book, 1765-1775," continued, contributed by Mabel L. Webber, copied by Elizabeth Heyward Jervey, *ibid.*
- "Marriage and Death Notices from the City Gazette of Charleston, S. C.," contributed by Elizabeth Heyward Jervey, *ibid.*
- "The Panton, Leslie Papers: Letters of Edmund Doyle, Trader, 1817," in the *Florida Historical Quarterly* (April).
- "Alexander Smith Atkinson, 1815-1894," by Edith Stetson Coleman, in the *Georgia Historical Quarterly* (June).
- "Letters of Georgia Editors and a Correspondent," edited by David K. Jackson, *ibid.*

- "Statistics and Cross-Sections of the Georgia Press to 1870," by Kenneth W. Rawlings, *ibid.*
- "A Faithful Ex-Slave Rewarded," by D. M. McKeithan, *ibid.*
- "Papers Relating to the Georgia-Florida Frontier, 1784-1800," XI, edited and translated by D. C. Corbitt, *ibid.*
- "Old Canoochee Backwoods Sketches," VI, by Julia E. Harn, *ibid.*
- "Minutes of the First Session of the Assembly of West Florida (November 3, 1766-January 3, 1767)," edited by James A. Padgett, in the *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* (April).
- "Records of the Superior Council of Louisiana, April-July, 1753," LXXIX, by Heloise H. Cruzat, marginal notes by Walter Prichard, *ibid.*
- "Index to the Spanish Judicial Records of Louisiana, November, 1783," LXI, by Laura L. Porteous, marginal notes by Walter Prichard, *ibid.*

GENERAL AND REGIONAL ARTICLES AND COMPILATIONS

- "The Attack upon West Point during the Civil War," by Harry Williams, in the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (March).
- "New Light on the Yankee Peddler," by Priscilla C. Kline, in the *New England Quarterly* (March).
- "The Rise of the Antislavery Movement in Southwestern Pennsylvania," by Robert Wallace Brewster, in the *Western Pennsylvania Historical Magazine* (March).
- "'Prock's' Last Letters to the Vincennes Western Sun," in the *Indiana Magazine of History* (March).
- "The Distinctiveness of Southern Culture," by Wilson Gee, in the *South Atlantic Quarterly* (April).
- "Constance Fenimore Woolson and the South," by Fred Lewis Pattee, *ibid.*
- "Post-War Diversions of the Rural South," by Josiah Moffatt, *ibid.*
- "Mr. Daniels Discovers the South," by Frank L. Owsley, in the *Southern Review* (Spring).
- "Hillbilly Realism," by C. Vann Woodward, *ibid.*
- "History and Historians at Chicago," by the Editors, in the *American Historical Review* (April).
- "John T. Morgan, Father of the Inter-Oceanic Canal," by A. L. Venable, in the *Southwestern Social Science Quarterly* (March).
- "The Transition from Slave to Free Agricultural Labor in the Southern States," by Oscar Zeichner, in *Agricultural History* (January).
- "Salient Changes in Southern Agriculture since the Civil War," by B. I. Wiley, *ibid.* (April).
- "The Overproduction of Cotton and a Possible Remedy," by Ulrich Bonnell Phillips, reprinted, *ibid.*

CONTRIBUTORS

AVERY CRAVEN is professor of history at the University of Chicago.

WALTER PRICHARD is professor of history at Louisiana State University.

RICHARD H. SHRYOCK is professor of history at the University of Pennsylvania.

THEODORE SALOUTOS is research assistant in the department of history of the University of Wisconsin.

FRED LONDON is librarian and associate professor of history at the University of Western Ontario.

GAVIN B. HENDERSON is lecturer on modern history at the University of Glasgow.

EAST TENNESSEE HISTORICAL SOCIETY

KNOXVILLE, TENNESSEE

SPECIAL STUDIES IN TENNESSEE HISTORY, No. 1

Sectionalism and Internal Improvements in Tennessee, 1796-1845. By Stanley J. Folmsbee, University of Tennessee, 278 pages. \$3.75

Special Introductory Price on orders received before October 15, 1939, \$3.25. Discount to libraries, educational institutions, and members of the East Tennessee Historical Society.

ANNUAL PUBLICATIONS No. 11 (1939)

PARTIAL TABLE OF CONTENTS

Papers from the Spanish Archives Relating to the Old Southwest, 1783-1800: III, 1787. Trans. and ed. by D. C. and Roberta Corbitt

The "J. Hartsell Memora": the Journal of a Tennessee Captain in the War of 1812. Ed. by Mary H. McCown

The Whigs in the Politics of the Confederacy. By Daniel M. Robison

Removal of the Cherokees, An Unnecessary Tragedy. By J. P. Brown

Branch Banking in Tennessee Prior to the Civil War. By C. A. Campbell

James K. Polk and the "Immortal Thirteen." By Powell Moore

The Freedmen's Bureau in Tennessee. By W. T. Jordan

Writings on Tennessee History, 1938. By Laura Luttrell

Subscription to annual *Publications*, \$2.00 per year; copies of the ten previous issues available at \$2.00 each.

Some contributors to previous numbers: T. P. Abernethy, E. M. Coulter, W. N. Franklin, P. M. Hamer, W. B. Hesseltine, G. F. Milton, J. W. Patton, C. H. Smith, Robert H. White, S. C. Williams

Order from the Secretary of the Society,
Lawson McGhee Library, Knoxville, Tennessee

THE PACIFIC HISTORICAL REVIEW

A scholarly journal devoted to the entire Pacific Area

Official organ of the
PACIFIC COAST BRANCH OF THE AMERICAN
HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION



LOUIS KNOTT KOONTZ, *Managing Editor*

JOHN W. CAUGHEY, *Associate Editor*

321 Administration Building, University of California at Los Angeles

Board of Editors: THOMAS A. BAILEY, DAN E. CLARK, W. HENRY COOKE,

CHARLES B. FAHS, FREDERIC L. PAXSON, WALTER N. SAGE



Its current and back numbers contain a wealth of material on Australia and the Pacific islands, China and Japan, Alaska, the Canadian West, the American West, and the Pacific nations of Hispanic America.

Eighth year of publication

\$4.00 a year

Special rates to students



A sample copy will be sent on request

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

THE SOUTHERN REVIEW A Critical Quarterly

IN THE SUMMER ISSUE

The Rhetoric of Hitler's "Battle," *Kenneth Burke*

The Genius of Democracy, *R. M. MacIver*

One Majority Against Another: *Populus Sempervirens*,
C. J. Friedrich

On the Preservation of Democracy for America,
Willmoore Kendall

FICTION

Family History, *P. M. Pasinetti*

Science and Society, *Lyle Lanier*

Humanism in the World of Einstein, *Herbert J. Muller*

Hulme and the Tragic View, *Dixon Wecter*

The Task of Concentration, *George Every, S. S. M.*

Praise, *Glenway Wescott*

The Death of Ivan Ilyich and Joseph K., *Philip Rahv*

POETRY

Flight of Sons and Other Poems,

David Cornel DeJong

SHORTER REVIEWS

The Oxford Anthology of American Literature
(edited by Benét and Pearson), *R. P. Blackmur*

Sophocles: *Electra* (Francis Fergusson),
Richmond Lattimore

75c a copy

\$3.00 a year

Published by
LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY PRESS
UNIVERSITY, LA., U.S.A.

THE SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

●

PRESIDENT

CHARLES S. SYDNOR, Duke University

VICE-PRESIDENT

FRANK L. OWSLEY, Vanderbilt University

SECRETARY-TREASURER

FLETCHER M. GREEN, University of North Carolina

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

(In addition to the officers named above)

EX-PRESIDENTS

(For three years following expiration of their terms)

CHARLES W. RAMSDELL, University of Texas (1939)

THOMAS P. ABERNETHY, University of Virginia (1940)

PHILIP M. HAMER, The National Archives (1941)

MANAGING EDITOR

WENDELL H. STEPHENSON, Louisiana State University

ELECTED MEMBERS

A. B. MOORE, University of Alabama (1939)

THOMAS S. STAPLES, Hendrix College (1939)

THOMAS D. CLARK, University of Kentucky (1940)

BENJAMIN B. KENDRICK, Woman's College of University of North Carolina (1940)

KATHRYN T. ABBEY, Florida State College for Women (1941)

AVERY O. CRAVEN, University of Chicago (1941)